

NYPL RESEARCH LIBRARIES



3 3433 07956103 5

THE COVENANT

ETERNAL LIFE

AS REVEALED IN THE SCRIPTURES

HOLY BIBLE

Asa
=FH



In the hopes of the latter day,
most affectionately yours,
Wesley James Fogg

THE COVENANT OF ETERNAL LIFE.

AN ARGUMENT

TO PROVE THAT

DEATH IS NOT OBLIGATORY ON CHRISTIANS,

BY THE CELEBRATED

JOHN ASGILL, Esq., M. P.

WITH

INTRODUCTORY ESSAY, MEMOIR, NOTES,

AND

MINISTERIAL TESTIMONY,

BY THE

REV. TRESHAM D. GREGG, D. D.

Chaplain St. Nicholas Within Dublin.

AUTHOR OF "THE MYSTERY OF GOD FINISHED," ETC., ETC., ETC.



New York:

ENNIS BROTHERS, PUBLISHERS AND PRINTERS.

No. 42 Dey Street.

1875.

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1875, by
ENNIS BROTHERS,
in the Office of the Librarian of Congress, Washington, D.C.

CONTENTS:

	PAGE.
PORTRAIT.	
TITLE.	
INTRODUCTORY.	9
MEMORANDA OF THE ACTION OF THE IRISH HOUSE OF COMMONS TAKEN AGAINST MR. ASGILL. (A. D. 1703,)	31
MEMORANDA OF THE ACTION OF THE ENGLISH HOUSE OF COMMONS TAKEN AGAINST MR. ASGILL. (A. D. 1707,)	34
MR. ASGILL'S DEFENCE OF HIS "ARGUMENT" BEFORE THE ENGLISH HOUSE OF COMMONS.	45
MR. ASGILL'S TREATISE, BEING "AN ARGUMENT PROVING THAT ACCORD- ING TO THE COVENANT OF ETERNAL LIFE REVEALED IN THE SCRIPTURES, MAN MAY BE TRANSLATED FROM HENCE INTO THAT ETERNAL LIFE WITHOUT PASSING THROUGH DEATH, ALTHOUGH THE HUMAN NATURE OF CHRIST HIMSELF COULD NOT BE THUS TRANSLATED TILL HE HAD PASSED THROUGH DEATH. (A.D. 1700)."	57
NOTES,	118
THE LATTER DAY REVELATION OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST, DELIVERED IN 1866—"AN INSTRUMENT OF MINISTERIAL TESTIMONY." . . .	129



INTRODUCTORY.

WITH SOME HISTORICAL MEMORANDA OF THE AUTHOR

JOHN ASGILL, Esq., M. P.



In the year 1866 I made a special voyage to New York, to bring out as an Ecclesiastical Missionary, because of the fulness of the time, the identical verity which in this extraordinary work is propounded by its now illustrious author. At that time I had never heard a syllable of his name, history, discovery, or sufferings because of it. This book of his is a martyr book. It was thrice burnt by the hands of the common hangman! Twice, by the unanimous vote of the House of Commons, in Ireland, and once in Westminster, by an analogous vote passed in the English House—but not unanimously there. It now, therefore, claims attention on a resurrectional ground; and not only so, but as sealed by such ecclesiastical and Divine authority as redeems its statements and its arguments from their merely absolute and logical force, and presents them to the consideration of the reader as a Divine message, constituting a wonderful fulfillment of the Oracles of Heaven.

Mr. Asgill was, during his life time, so universally viewed as a dreaming enthusiast, that little is, as yet, known of the specialities of his biography. Where wisdom was before its time, as in the case of our author, fame is an afterbirth, which scarcely sees the light until the memorials of its claimant have disappeared. Let us hope that this disinterment of the name of a great man may lead to inquiries about him that shall hereafter be repaid by satisfactory mementos. With respect to the exact date of his birth, his parentage,

education, personal appearance, and *and* in general, the Editor is at present in the dark. And the brief biographical notice which he subjoins, gives a summary of all that he knows of the man. We find him thus mentioned in *Chambers's Encyclopædia*:

“ ASGILL, JOHN, an eccentric English *littérateur*, born about the middle of the 17th century. He studied for the bar, and at intervals during the whole of his checkered life transacted legal business in some form or other; but having early displayed a predilection for writing political pamphlets, he soon became involved, in spite of his cleverness, in serious pecuniary difficulties. Fortunately for *him*, Parliament had just passed an act (1699) for the resumption of forfeited estates in Ireland, and Commissioners were appointed to settle claims. A bright vision flitted across the mind of the much-harassed man. He sailed for the sister isle, and found the whole country wrangling in lawsuits. His talents, and the favor of the Commissioners, secured to him a lucrative practice; and he even acquired sufficient influence to obtain a seat in the Irish Parliament. Some time, however, before taking possession of his seat, Asgill had published a most extraordinary pamphlet, entitled ‘*An argument proving that, according to the Covenant of Eternal Life revealed in the Scriptures, man may be translated hence into that Eternal Life without passing through Death, (1700).*’ Much to Asgill’s surprise, the public flew into a rage against this absurd production; the Irish parliament voted it a blasphemous libel, and the astonished author was expelled from the House after four days. In 1705, Asgill returned to England, and entered the English Parliament as Member for Bramber, in Sussex. But the fame of his unlucky pamphlet haunted him perpetually, and at last proved a Nemesis; for the English House, to be not less virtuous than the Irish one, took up the treatise, condemned it to be burnt by the common hangman, as profane and blasphemous, and expelled Asgill on the 18th of December, 1707. After this, his circumstances rapidly grew worse, until at last he found something like peace in the King’s Bench and the Fleet, between which two places his excursions were confined for the term of his natural life. Here he continued to practice professionally, and—for he never succeeded in overcoming this weakness—to indite innumerable pamphlets on political and theological topics. He died in November, 1738.” *

* *Chambers's Encyclopædia*, London, 1860.

The death of our author was supposed to afford an indubitable evidence of the unsoundness of the principles for which, in this work, and in other works of the same kind, published during his life time, he argued : whereas, all that the fact proved was that he was premature in looking for the results that he so forcibly drew as conclusions from the premises which he laid down. He was, in short, before his time, in advance of his age and generation ; the world was not ripe for his conclusions, and consequently they then produced no results—save the very unpleasant ones of the persecution and intolerance through which he suffered. The age in which he lived was, in religious matters, one of intolerance and persecution. These were the sole principles of security against error that the Reformed Church had learnt from Mediæval Romanism; and, when they appeared to be called for, they were exercised with a high hand. There can be no manner of doubt that had not the Church of Rome been thus trodden out in Ireland by penal laws, enacted in conformity with Roman practice, in the reigns of Elizabeth, of the Stuarts, and in those of the three Georges, the Roman Catholic Church would have survived as an established power in this country; and the Chantry Priest of St. Nicholas Within Dublin would have been more likely to be encouraging persecutors to hunt down “fanatics” of the type of John Asgill, than allowed himself to employ his endowments to secure for the whole world through his teaching, not only the benefit of the principles of literal immortality that Asgill laid hold of, but other supernatural privileges,* which action, in his position as a beneficed clergyman, in an exempt jurisdiction, he is now enabled, with a certain measure of ecclesiastical weight, to submit to the Church in general.

Amongst the historical memoranda which follow will be found a very natural and interesting answer given by Asgill to the question that was put to him by a friend : “What, in the name of wonder, could have put so preposterous an idea into your head?” And his answer amounts to just this, that, having the Bible among his books, he was aroused to the consideration of certain passages of great obscurity that were not adequately explained by preachers or commentators, but which came home to his mind as quite satisfactory in their meaning, when viewed from the stand-point of his published

* See the “*Instrument of Ministerial Testimony*,” given by the Editor at the appointed time,—page 129.

and extraordinary views. And this position of his will be found amply sustained in the pages of his formerly condemned, but now revived work.

If, indeed, we consider the subject dispassionately, we shall find that the whole point of his argument merely enforces what all Christians confess even in their ordinary creeds. The point which he presses home is just this, that, the redemption won by Christ was co-extensive with the loss which man incurred through the rebellious fall or disobedience of our first parents; and since it was that fall which “brought death into the world and all our woe,” redemption must, to be complete, bring perfect life with all its consequences. This came home to the mind of John Asgill with a force that was to him new and fresh, and because he pressed it as such on his contemporaries, he was, on that very account, viewed as a blasphemer, and by them pushed out of society amid general scorn and execration; whereas, had they had the patience calmly to weigh his opinions, they would have been forced to acknowledge that it was on their essential truth the best received and most universally acknowledged of the Articles of their own Christian Creed rested—such as, “I believe in the resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting;”* “I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come.”† “All men shall rise again with their bodies, and shall give account for their own works; and they that have done good shall go into life everlasting;”‡ etc. The force of all Asgill’s arguments was directed to demonstrate that the redemption which Christ purchased with his own blood had won all this for man. A principle which the Church always admitted. And yet it was because our author enforced these arguments that he was intolerantly condemned as a blasphemer, expelled from his seats in two parliaments, and his book burnt by the common hangman. The sweeping condemnation of the Irish and English parliaments, condemned, with a hasty precipitancy, in their philosophical and general sense, the actual creeds of all Christendom—although I grant that the point specially intended as wrong and blasphemous was not this enforcement of the sufficiency of Christ’s atonement for everlasting life, but the special circumstance, which Asgill insisted on, that this everlasting life was a present thing, then to be laid hold on and enjoyed, whereas all the creeds and

* *Apostle’s Creed.*

† *Nicene Creed.*

‡ *Athanasian Creed.*

the whole scripture united in declaring that everlasting life, in the sense explained by our author, was not to come into operation during time at all. That it was not to begin to operate till there "should be time no longer"—till doomsday—till the day of judgment, nor, in short, until the ever-enduring ages of eternity had succeeded to the transitory and perishing years, or days, or hours of time. Had the Senates, which condemned our author, duly discriminated in the case, they would not have been led into the action of intolerance and persecution that we now so unhesitatingly condemn as atrocious and unchristian, and they would, perhaps, have helped their victim to see that, although he was not essentially wrong, he was, at least, circumstantially so, and that the main truth, which he so powerfully enforced, was, as he presented it, dissociated from those scripturally predicted surroundings which should accompany it, and which were essential to render it productive of the results that he expected from it. In fact the contending parties, Asgill and his opponents, were on both sides partially right and partially wrong: they were laboring both under a cloud of darkness that prevented the possibility of their seeing things correctly. But their joint and several courses of action are well calculated to instruct and warn us who have arrived at times which are essentially different, and which need but to be fully understood in order to lead all intelligent Christians to see that all the circumstances which are essential to the realization of Asgill's hopes are now existent, and that when the faithful can be persuaded calmly to consider the fully opened Oracles of Heaven, they will satisfactorily see that the scripture is now fulfilled, the Kingdom of Heaven is already with us, and that we may now put out our hand and take of the Tree of Life and live forever. And not only so, but that the hour is come when they that are in their graves may be made to hear, through the Church, His voice, and to come forth. Why is this?

I reply, for two reasons: the 1st, *absolute*, or demonstrable on scriptural, reasonable, and historical grounds. The 2d, *relative*, or having a necessary relation to the missionary messenger, or ecclesiastical servant of the Lord who proclaims the truth.

Our readers will bear it in mind that this is but an introductory essay, and that it must be brief to be effective. Hence, it but

touches on the points involved, acting rather as a finger post for students who may wish to investigate, to direct them to the channels of information that may fully satisfy them, than as itself pretending to exhaust the subject, or fill up the outlines which it sketches.

I. Now, it is absolutely demonstrable from scripture, from ecclesiastical history, and from a crowding assembly of most weighty evidences that the year 1866 was the very year of doom; that, from the foundation of the world, the Lord intended that in that year all things that had been predicted should be fulfilled. Let this astonish no one. We have an analogical fact to confirm our statement. None of our Christian readers will gainsay the universally acknowledged truth that it was at the hour when our Lord from Calvary's cross with a loud voice cried "it is finished," and gave up the ghost, that the wondrous plan of the redemption of mankind was consummated. That moment, and that cry concerned the whole universe. It tied an accomplished fact to a place and time that were foreseen and foreordained before ever the earth was, and that impressed a character upon the Creator and upon all his creatures that was to work for ever and ever. We know already sufficient to know that it needs no piled up language of exaggeration or of enforcement to lead to the acknowledgement of this. And yet, stupendous as was the fact, surpassingly wonderful as were its circumstances and its issues, it was to the men who witnessed it an ordinary every day occurrence. "It was only a malefactor (*John, xiii: 30*) who was executed; an impostor whose contemptible pretensions (*Matthew, xxvii: 63*) were exposed and put an end to forever. We heard a good deal of him and his absurd claims to a Sacred Character; but this fiasco has wound up the matter, and it is all over now." It was in this way the lookers on blasphemously spoke of the astonishing fact which completed the work of redemption, and it passed away thus. Now, so it was likewise in 1866. A work was then done that magnified the Divine wisdom and foreknowledge. It concerned, and was actually, in due time to be seen as, a constituting element of the everlasting life of millions,—buried and unborn,—and yet it may be said to have "come without observation," (*see Luke, xxi: 20*); to have crept in, unheeded, as a thief in the night, (*Rev., iii: 3; xxi: 15*); but, as the sequel will show, all the more validly on that very account. This will become more and more

evident as ages roll on; and it will grow to be thought to have as necessary a relation to an immortal existence in felicity as the story and the doctrine of the cross has had for ages past to the peace and hope of the dying hours of the believer. It is impossible to enlarge on this subject here. But it is on record, from the age of Luther down to our day, that the Reformed Church constantly looked forward to the year of our Lord 1866 as about to be the decisive year. Most of the great writers of the Christian Church, for centuries before it came, anticipated the year mentioned as about to be the year of redemption—and the year of vengeance too. The evidences on this point have been sufficiently accumulated by Mr. Elliott in his *Horæ Apocalypticæ*. For myself, I can say, that, from the time that I was awakened to the sense of the importance of the Prophetic Scriptures, I made up my mind upon the point that “the great day of the Lord” would be in *Anno Domini* 1866. This was printed and published as my conclusion in the pages of the *Witness*, which I published as a serial at Leeds, in 1831-2; and, again, (in a new series), at Sheffield, in 1835-6; in my discussion with Father Maguire, in 1838, and subsequently in many printed documents, I was influenced by the same date as about to be the coming finale—thus accepting, as my own, the general voice of the Church. Mr. Elliot, the first edition of whose great work appeared in 1844, throughout the whole of his pages enforces the same conclusion. He writes, “the epoch was noted as a remarkable one both by Romanists and Protestants. Paul the Deacon and Anastasius declare that it was in 606 that Phocas passed his decree.”* (Making the Pope the head of the universal Church). And Luther himself says, “the Pope and the Turk began at almost one time under the Emperor Phocas.”† After him Oslander, who dated it similarly, writes “*A Foca Imperators qui Papatum ipse Primatum publico edicto stabilivit.*” So, too, Bullinger speaks, under the fifth trumpet and on Apocalypse xiii xvii,‡ of the Papacy having been established by Gregory I. and the decree of Phocas. Again, John Foxe,§ on the Vision of the Witnesses, writes, “If the commencing date, on this principle of Angelic months and years, be dated from Alaric’s taking Rome, the ending date will be in 1672; if from Phocas’s decree its ending would be 1866.” And so, once more, Pareus on Apocalypse xii:14. This array of early names

* *Horæ Apocalypticæ*, vol. 3, page 163.

† *Addresses*, 39, 57, 74.

‡ *Table Talk*, II. 843.

§ *Page 145 Cites Chytrous.*

I have taken from Mr. Elliot, and it gives the voice of the Church as sounded forth by the great majority of her authorities. The minds of many were shaken as to this special year by a Roman authority of some weight, Cardinal Muratori, who alleged that the exact year of Phocas's decree was not 606 but 607. This led to a perilous diversion of men's minds that was calculated to divide their attention. And, from the greatness of the benefit which flowed to me from fixing my attention upon a given point of time for some years of vigilance carried on without intermission, I have been led to conclude that this distraction of the attention of Christians was a device of the enemy to prevent any one from arriving at the vastly important discovery, to which I attained by firmly resolving that nothing should cause me to waver even by a hair's breadth from the conviction to which I had reached, many years before, that 1866, and that year alone, was to be awaited as "the day of vengeance of our God." (*Isaiah, lvi : 1*). At first I contemplated the year, *per se*, as the year which was discriminated from all others by the circumstance that it was separated by an interval of 1260 years, or "a time times and half a time," from the setting up of Anti-Christian domination in the Church. This view fixed me to it as affording one or two points of time that should be especially looked out for. And, by having the mental eye thus directed for years, I was led at last to see that not that year only but the whole of the 60th decade in the 19th century had been from the very beginning of the world fixed on in the counsels of the Father to be a "wall" which should divide time from eternity. In this wall, or decade of years, there were ten distinct years: 1860, 1861, 1862, 1863, 1864, 1865, 1866, 1867, 1868, 1869, 1870—ten stones, five on each side of the middle one (1865), which is the stone of division, and is not counted. The first, 1860, wholly faces time, and the last, 1870, wholly faces eternity. The two moieties of the wall are on each side of the central keystone, or stone of division. There are five on the time side that begin with 1860 and end with 1864, and five on the eternity side that end with 1870 and begin with 1866. Thus, 1866 is said to be the year of doom, for it was decreed that in that year the law of the eternal world should be proclaimed and begin to operate.

Hitherto what I have said relates to numbers, and to the position

that *Anno Domini* 1866 was the predicted year that was to bring in life and immortality in the higher and literal sense of which I have spoken in my Message to the Church Universal, and which John Asgill maintained in his "Argument." It is my position that it is demonstrable that 1866, and no other year, was the Year of Doom! Nay, I venture to say that the innumerable books which are in existence to enforce that point prove it to demonstration; and I can claim them all as on my side—from Martin Luther to Mr. Elliott. I claim, also, to have sufficiently demonstrated the principle in the sermon which I preached before Trinity College, Dublin, for my Degree of Doctor in Sacred Theology, in the year 1853, and that it is sustained by the dense cloud of witnesses to whom I have just alluded.

Such, then, is my first or absolute reason for alleging that eternal life, without the intervention of the grave, together with exemption from disease or decay, is now, upon the general adoption of a scripturally demonstrable law of life, within reach. Let it be investigated. Let the validity of the great array of witnesses that I have alluded to be fairly tried, and the soundness of the conclusion that I have drawn will be admitted.

II. However, the reply will be given with full confidence, "How can you pretend that 1866 was the predicted year which constituted the great day of the Lord, when every thing continues now as it was then. When the year came and went, and nothing happened to distinguish it from the half-dozen years that preceded and that followed it?"

My rejoinder to this reply will be, suppose, for argument sake, my Message prove to be well founded. Suppose after the lapse of ten generations, or any other assigned number, I shall still be found alive and well, and verifying by an ever increasing power that the principle which I have announced is true and from God, will men be likely to be found to dispute it then? Can it be supposed possible that they will not gather around the then Enoch, of say Enoch's age, 365 years, and be only too solicitous to be taught how to walk with God, so as that they may each be made a participator of like benefits? Nay, will not one hundred years, or even fifty, by their simple transit, leaving the Messenger a living demonstration of the truth

of his principles, work wonders of conviction in gainsayers? It is beyond a question that they will. However, I shall be met by my own example, and the case of John Asgill be cast up against me. He had such a confidence as I now speak of, and yet he did not stretch his span of life beyond the ordinary limits. So strong were his convictions, that, after he had brought forward his arguments, feeling them to be indisputable, he said, "If I am mistaken in the dependence upon which I repose, I shall die of no religion at all." This was the tenth item of blasphemy that was advanced against him in the English House of Commons. And his death, which took place in due time, was supposed to constitute a full justification of the sentence which denounced him as guilty. Yet, here I am now to explain the reasons of his death, and to make it evident that they are of such a nature as to leave his arguments in full force when the reasons why he died, notwithstanding them, are understood.

But while the perpetuation of my life, as the Messenger of this great dispensation, would, undoubtedly, constitute a strong argument for the truth of the principle on which I take my stand, I can not allow the supposition to be well founded that would make my death, in the ordinary course of Nature, to be a counter-demonstration on the other side. For there is some reason to suppose that life will not be perpetuated for any one, nor the resurrection of any of the dead be achieved, until faith in this last day revelation of the nature of the work of redemption shall be quite general. Sacrificial worship effectuates, as I hold, a real out-pour of the vitalizing element from the faith-seen Cross of Calvary. It may not be, however, until this out-pour shall constitute a river, broad and sufficiently deep to be, in the figurative language of the Prophet, swam in, that it shall operate its vitalizing effect upon the converted worshiper. (Let the reader study attentively, as perhaps sustaining this position, *Ezekiel, chapter xlii : 5—12 verses*). The analogy of the past would seem to warrant this statement. While we trace this latter day civilization of ours, and the benefits which it yields to every individual, and to every hearth and home in Christendom, to the operation in every direction of Christian principles; yet through what centuries of gainsaying and antagonism, of error and of apostasy, of self-seeking and of schismatical working have they not

had to struggle on? And even still (to take up the Parable of the Prophet) "the miry places and the marshes thereof are not healed, but given up to salt." (*Ibid, verse 11*). I am, therefore, disposed to think that the full benefits of this last day dispensation will not be fully realized for all until Christian society in both its divisions, the spiritual and the political, shall coöperate to place the crown upon the head of Him "whose right it is;" and until popularly enacted law shall cause the means of grace for perpetual life and its circumstances to flow deeply through all the channels of society.

While the Christian religion was at best but partially known, and to a great measure quite unknown and misapprehended, its establishment by law was of questionable value, or even possibly attended with injurious consequences, not uncalculated to warrant the cry made against it. But when Christ comes to his church with the full manifestation of his will, and ties miraculous issues to the conjoint action of believers, which can not be brought about without law, or which can be better effected thereby than otherwise, gain-saying as to an Established Religion will cease. None will stand up for consumption, bronchitis, and ague; for small-pox, typhoid fever, and scarlatina, with their attendant death, on "the voluntary system," when the religion of Jesus Christ, demonstrable from open scripture, and "established by law," will secure the enjoyment of perpetual health and life, with other supernatural benefits, thus superseding hospitals, dispensaries, and asylums of all kinds.

Now, since I have obtained my advanced knowledge and (if it be knowledge, then also) wisdom in a course of action in strict conformity with the laws, canons and ordinances of the Holy Catholic Church, in the Anglican communion, and with that branch of it with which my lot was by my vocation cast, I cannot deviate from the strict line of duty in any respect, lest I should by my volunteer action go astray and forfeit my privileges. If men then desire the benefits of which I speak, they must aid me and work with me in my conscientious action according to the line of duty that I follow—for otherwise I dare not act at all.

Asgill's position was, that, the death of Christ constituted an atonement that was a full discharge for Adam's offence, and for all the consequences which it entailed, and, that, man died simply

because he wanted perspicacity to see this, courage to rely on it as all sufficient, and wisdom to plead it against the common enemy Death; for, that, God was so righteous a judge and governor, that, if the plea were courageously advanced, it would be in justice acknowledged, and so man be allowed to live for ever. Now here a great truth was pleaded, but one not less important overlooked.

It was undoubtedly true that Christ's atonement, and obedience unto death, had paid the ransom demanded for man's liberation from penalty. But, it was overlooked, that, death was not to be triumphed over save as "the last enemy." Christ "must reign till he hath placed all enemies under his feet; the last enemy that shall be destroyed is death" (*1 Corinthians, xv : 25, 26*). At his resurrection, our Lord's triumph was all through connected with intimations to his followers that he left them to endure mourning, lamentation and woe, unbroken by his interference save that, as an invisible Providence, he should set a hitherto and no further to the violence of the adversary: the gates of Hell (which are the grave) should not *prevail* against the Church; but they, nevertheless, should war against it with a most potent antagonism, up to any extent of humiliation and subjugation short of absolute prevalence; while under distress and breach, exemption only from total defeat was promised, with consolation through "a Comforter" under affliction. Nay, more, there was given a foretold revelation of every stage in the announced affliction. This was especially written and placed in the hands of the Church, and it included information as to the dates which, during a course of ages that should run through twenty centuries, every great event concerning the Church should bear. While predictions on the whole subject pervade the whole of the Sacred Writings, their special locale is the Apocalypse and the writings of the Prophet Daniel. Now, all these documents, when intelligently read, and in the proper spirit, conspire in pointing to and fixing the attention of the wise upon the aforesaid epoch 1866 as constituting the termination of the weakness and endurance of the Church and the commencement for it of, at once, a triumph unexampled in its nature, and of "the day of vengeance of our God." (*Isaiah, lvi : 2*). There was, moreover, connected with the Epoch, in our Lord's reference to it, a speciality of a very peculiar character, and this was, that, he

exhausted language, and one might almost say, (with reverence be it spoken), he exhausted patience too, in reiterating again and again, and again, a warning with respect to it, to watch! Watch, watch, watch! What I say unto one I say unto all, watch! The day will come, as a thief (watch!) to break open your house, (*Matthew, xiii:44*), watch! There is a snare in the case for all that dwell on the face of the whole earth—watch! “Behold, I come as a thief, blessed is he that watcheth and keepeth his garments.”

These reiterated injunctions very deeply impressed me, and with at once, as the time drew nigh, confidence, determination and alarm. Alarm, lest I should at His coming be found unwatchful, and so find myself cast out; confidence that I could at least fulfill this simple command; and determination that I would watch so as man never watched before. I early resolved to give myself to the work of vigilance exclusively. That I might do so, I made elaborate calculations as to the time of our Lord's life and history, and, having received reassuring answers from high authority in the learned world, I separated myself from all other avocations that I might carry out a work of systematic vigilance: for I resolved that my vigilance should be systematically and incessantly carried forward, and, also, in connection with permanent written records. Our Lord's age from his birth to his death; again from his birth to the end of his final year, A. D. 33, (the last day of Daniel's seventy weeks); again the interval from the time that I began to watch to the Anniversary of the Crucifixion in A. D. 1866, and the interval also from the same starting point to the end of 1866, constituted three streams of duration which, with several others also, I kept on record from day to day—counting not merely the days and the hours, but, lest I should lose any possible item of the exacted watchfulness, I drew down my streams of duration to the minutes and the seconds of time through every day as it ran on and ran out. In fact, I acted with respect to '66, as I suppose our Lord did with respect to 33; and the two points of time referred to were the anniversary of the Crucifixion and that of the Nativity—which included the last day of the year, six days later. And the record lies by me, and shall be preserved forever in dense streams of figures—these, with subsequent like records of vigilance, filling eight volumes as large as the ledgers of a counting-house—for they are an abiding and unde-

niable evidence of the reality of that hope of "the Revelation of the Lord" by which I was possessed and on which I acted, supposing that it was his personal advent that was to come. Being prepared to submit these volumes of records to inspection, I unaffectedly declare that I myself never view them as monuments of vigilance without a measure of amazement: and, when I reflect upon the results, of gratitude too. The case was truly enough one of *parturiens mons*—I certainly expected that the end would be the coming of the Lord, for which I was preparing, whereas my figuring proved to be a clue that led me into the midst of a new Bible of figures, as significant as the old Bible of letters and words, comprising history and prophecy, precept and promise, law and Gospel, and as certainly inspired by the Holy Ghost, and more wonderful than that with which all are more or less acquainted, for this new bible discovered the law of literal and present immortality for the body, together with perpetual health, strength and freshness of person, so as that the believer's "leaf (otherwise, his personal appearance) should not wither," that "whatsoever he should do should prosper," with additional wonders more wonderful still, but all detailed in my American testimony.

I add further, that, the very fact, or series of facts, which grew out of the faith which I had in "the fulness of the times" led to settled habits of keeping on record the numbers of sacred and personal times (as the numbers of the days of our Lord's and my own personal existence) that I found myself subsequently under a necessity of adhering to, and that this very necessity led me to develop still more fully. Thence I was led to see in this new method of life a relation to a variety of additional Scriptural truths of the utmost interest and importance. These truths had reference to every proper name recorded in the holy Scripture, and, indeed, to all names in all languages, and that not as mere matter of idle curiosity, but as connected with ecclesiastical action on the part of the Church that must as certainly lead to resurrection from the dead, as the disintering of a seed from an Egyptian mummy, and the planting of it in a soil where it should be brought under the operation of those causes which elicit vegetative life from the seminal growth, would lead to its fructification and propagation under the ordinary processes of agricultural law. Thus, I was gradually led to the conviction that the work

of the redemption of mankind from disease, decay, and death, and the restoration of all the buried faithful, was to be accomplished *through the Church*, and that we had arrived at the discovery that the grand finale that was universally expected to be about to be accomplished by the second advent of Christ was, in fact, to be brought about otherwise, and in a manner that would more signally and wonderfully glorify the Almighty!

None will deny that if in 1866 a great white throne had appeared among the clouds, with one like unto the Son of Man seated on it, that if all Christendom had been suddenly "caught up" and made to stand before it, some on the right and some on the left hand, while heaving graves poured forth countless thousands arrayed in white robes to join the vast assembly, and that every item of the well-known conjectural programme of the prophetic interpreters had been after this sort realized, it would have been very glorious, surprising, and stupendous. The question is, who would have been there on the occasion? And surely the organizers of the great religious societies, their chairmen, treasurers, and trustees would be admitted to a high place. Surely, the great sensational preachers and money-gatherers for religious objects, to whom thousands bow down in admiration, (of their money-getting power in fact), would have been conspicuous figures. Surely, the chiefs of religious churches of all sorts would have soared aloft—and vast would have been the amazement had the most famous names of our times not been there in some way or other recognizable. "There's his Grace; so I expected. But where's my Lord? And where's the Dean, and the Archdeacon? And where's our much revered Pastor? Which is St. Paul? And which the Blessed Virgin?" The mere attempt, not to sketch the whole grandeur of the scene, (that would be beyond human power), but to lay hold, even in idea, on a few of the salient particulars, will serve to show the wondrous wisdom of the alternative that the truth does in fact develope. By the first coming of Christ, and through the excruciating, heart-piercing finale, "the thoughts of many hearts were revealed," for comparatively few came to the Messiah of the carpenter's bench until, through Providential circumstances, he was manifested as Chief in the Palace of the Cæsars under Constantine. And then they flattered

themselves that they crowded round him for his absolute and intrinsic worth. Now, also, through a like profundity of wisdom, a plan, the simplest in the world, shows whether there is "faith on the Earth." (*see Luke, xviii : 8.*) A simple gospel message delivered by a minister of the church, who never viewed himself as a higher character than the chiefest of sinners saved by grace through faith only, and who was only known as striving to fulfill from day to day the calls of his position, without aiming at aught else than simply to meet his duties as they called, is made use of to detect the hollowness of profession, the worldliness of claimants to heavenly-mindedness, and to lay bare to the very core the character of the Christian world everywhere.

Every gathering of worshippers in Christendom implies more or less earnestness in each and all to attain to eternal life and win a crown of glory in the presence of the Lord forevermore. This is the motive which is supposed to animate believers, and to stir them to expend thousands of thousands, and millions in the founding of Churches, Schools, Hospitals, Tabernacles, Synagogues, Asylums, and what not. Of course there is a vast amount of awakened sentiment and display of good will in the lines of action that issue in these results, and they claim to spring simply from religious faith; but tested by the *aqua fortis* of divine wisdom, and of simple truth, what a brilliancy of the precious metal takes its departure, leaving to manifest itself the virus of a base alloy! It thus seems that it is not eternal life and the light of the countenance of the Invisible Giver thereof that is in truth the object. Nor is it in reality God that is worshipped. Men are attracted by the crowd. They are inspired by the rush of thousands. They will not be behind their neighbors. They will not be out of the religious fashion of the hour. They will keep up their church; or they will make a name by the choice of a party, making way, and "sure to win." They will leave behind a venerated name—wisely sacrificing to their net, and burning incense to their drag. Behold, the anatomy of millions of the faithful. "The faithful?" while, throughout their whole existence, they have turned a deaf ear to the dying injunctions of their Lord! Attentive vigilance carried out would have conducted at the time to the discovery which it opened to me at 1866; which, God forgive me,

I never tried before, and which was never acted on by mortal man since it was carried out by our Lord himself previously to his death, (for I am convinced His precepts to vigilance, Watch! Watch! Watch! grew out of this practice in his own case). All the facts tending to prove that the creature in his best state is altogether vanity—nothing, and less than nothing. That all our boasted excellence is shallow, superficial, and worthless; and that He alone who originated the creature can impart or implant qualities superior to the merest vanity. Consequently that of Him, and from Him, and by Him are all things: that to Him alone is owing worship, and honor, and praise; and that creature worship, more or less, is nothing short of treason against Heaven. Not so much a simple delusion, as a killing apostasy from the prime duty of the creature: that is, to worship and to serve God alone.

It is my claim that my message is nothing less than a Divine legation; and if it truly announce, as I believe it does, a change in the law of nature that must be miraculous, it can be no less, (for who but the God of Nature can operate a change in the Law of Nature?) And not the least remarkable circumstance connected with it is the way in which the messenger was prepared to deliver it, and the world was prepared to receive it. How unfitted the world was for the message of life in the time of John Asgill, or at any previous period, is made manifest by the treatment that he experienced, and by the annals of Ecclesiastical history antecedently. Because he was a lay man in Parliament he was expelled from his seat as a blasphemer, and at the same time he was laughed to scorn because he, as a layman, had the presumption to handle questions in theology.

My position, on the other hand, was that of a clergyman of the highest order of authority, for I was called to receive the degree of Doctor in Sacred Theology by the zeal, admiration, and approval of the whole Protestant public, and through their liberality, so that I was fitted as a divine of the highest qualifications by the highest tribunal of learning in the Kingdom, which acted at the call of the general public, so that, in the orderings of Divine Providence, I was endorsed and upon proofs publicly admitted of my competency in a way that none could gainsay. And yet, I doubt not, had I been called on to deliver my delegated message at a time when the church of Ireland

was under the inspiration of political authorities, I would have been sacrificed by the "Whateley" of the day, in order, in some shape or other, to propitiate Party. The laws of the State Church rendered a single clergyman subject to possible detriment, disparagement, or damage through the Prelates or one of the Order. However, the law of disestablishment abrogated all these laws, and rid me of the risk of discredit or damage, if such were to be contemplated through a manageable hierarchy. The records of the times of John Asgill inform us that his sufferings arose through the hostility of the whole body of the clergy. They were all against him. One of them published a pamphlet violently assailing him, and this was dedicated, by his own permission, to the then Archbishop of Dublin, the most highly esteemed divine of those days, Doctor Narcissus Marsh, under whose *imprimatur* the document was printed. It was a mild expression of the general feelings of the clergy. Surely if they so resented that which was declared blasphemy when it appeared through the authorship of a lawyer, uncontrollable would have been their indignation had it emanated from a churchman. Asgill was particularly inoffensive—a mere *opinionaire*, not at all a propagandist of his peculiar views. He seemed rather incautiously betrayed into printing, than led to do so by anything resembling religious zeal. The book rather dropped from his hands with a sort of apprehension of evil from it, than was pushed into circulation to make proselytes. Yet, notwithstanding this, he was in consequence driven from society, and persecuted to the death. Now, on the contrary, I was allowed to bring out views much more extreme than those of Asgill, as a boon to the Church, and as a means of warding off evils by which it was menaced. Had they even been entertained, they would in the very nature of things have necessarily postponed the evil day. And had they been, on due examination, found as ecclesiastically sound, and proved so, deferred it forever. There is no member of the Irish Church who can now deny this; or, at least, if he ventures on the denial, prove it valid. For it is out of the power of logic to demonstrate that if inquiry had been instituted into my views, and Mr. Gladstone been informed that the questions which I had raised previously, both by petition in Parliament, in both Houses of Convocation of both of the English Provinces Canterbury and York, and

in the Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States, were under investigation, he would not at least have postponed his hostile action for dis-establishment and dis-endowment until a decision had been arrived at, and that that postponement would not have eventuated in a triumph for the Church. I contend that it would. Who can prove that it would not? And this state of things makes me now to say truly, as I do firmly believe it, that, through the effect of my principles, I am now the *only* uninjured and undegraded member of the Irish branch of the late United Church of England and Ireland. With the gift of eternal life, I have a perpetuity in my church estates which I shall thus, please God, retain forever. When Mr. Asgill startled his age by declaring that death could be avoided—that, by virtue of the redemption that had been accomplished by Christ, the children of Adam might escape not only death of the soul, but that of the body also—he promulgated a great verity. But he overlooked the conditions that were needed to render it effective. For such immortality, not merely the certainty of the principle for which he argued was needed, but the arrival of the season to which it was assigned. And, when that should come, there would be needed, also, the proclamation to mankind at that time, by due authority from Heaven, of the astonishing change in the laws of nature and of life that had thus arrived.

The event has served to open up the matter still further. Christ had been preached and received as the Saviour of the soul under terms of salvation that involved the idea that it was “appointed unto men once to die,” a salvation conferred, in short, with the idea of the disease, or decay and death of the body. The very rite which grafted the neophyte, whether infant or adult, into the Church was, after a manner, a forecasting of the finale that was adjudged to be universal: for he was “buried with him by baptism into death.” (*Romans, vi: 4*). And every writer in the Bible was so inspired to speak of death as certain. Hence, it was as the Saviour of dying men that Christ had been revealed by all the Apostles and preachers of the Church ever since. But this was only the first stage in the work of redemption. Through this and thus far men were only “begotten to a lively hope” of a higher

thing—what was that? The same Apostle himself at once answers, a “salvation ready to be revealed in the last time.” (*see 1 Peter, i:3-5*). And this was called emphatically “the Revelation of Christ.” The Apostle speaks of it most encouragingly further on at the 13th verse, thus, “Wherefore gird up the loins of your mind, be sober, and hope to the end for the grace (or favor of this revelation) that is to be brought unto you at the revelation of Jesus Christ.” We may well suppose that the holy Apostles were themselves led to think that the predicted grace or favor of this revelation was to be the actual personal appearance and second coming of the Lord in the same human body in which he had been crucified, and to this view of the subject the translators of our “authorized version” contributed when they translated the very same word ἀποκάλυψις (apocalypse or revelation) *coming*, in 1 Corinthians, i:7, writing thus, “waiting for the *coming* of our Lord Jesus Christ.” And this view of a second advent, as the more sensational and striking, was universally adopted as the correct nature of the coming future. Whereas, the Lord from the very beginning knew that it would be nothing more, for the first at least, than the preaching of him, in a new way, as the Saviour of the whole man without the annexed condition of death for the body.

Practically speaking, however, I find it to have been of immense importance that I was preceded in my very extraordinary work by a forerunner like Asgill. In an announcement so extraordinary, men can scarce hear it without being led to entertain the idea that the man who announces it must be crazy, beside himself, out of his mind! It takes off the necessity for this supposition to be informed that a man of learning and of high position, enriched with legal wisdom and great ability, and quite removed from any imputation of fanaticism, was led previously to entertain the same hypothesis on quite distinct grounds. His arguments are so sound and valid that it is unnecessary to go over the ground which they have made sure. While the reasons why they failed of being followed by the expected results in his day are so plain they do not now stand in the way at all; on the contrary, their re-motion constitutes a ground for entirely new arguments in favor of Asgill's hypothesis, and causes men to lift up their heads admitting that all that alters the case immensely. In experience I have found that intelligent opponents who gave to my

statements an unwavering and forcible opposition, have been vastly shaken when they became aware, from the view of his book, that, after all, I had but disinterred the hypothesis of a person who had some claim to be an authority. I have found, moreover, that the foul intolerance with which he was visited,—in having been twice thrust out of Parliament, and his book, by the votes of the House, thrice burnt by the common hangman,—have originated a sympathy for him of the sort felt for a martyr, and disposed hearers to the conviction that so much earnestness must have sprung from the conviction that the victim must have felt that he had very firm ground to rest on. I sincerely trust that these reasons may prevail with all those who may read these pages, as well for their own sakes as for the sake of mankind in general.

Because, while our blessed God has thus opened to his children a blessed hope as to a good time now within reach, he has tied the results to a course of action in the way of religious duty, without which the great blessings (health, strength, and life) will not be realized. Do we not all acknowledge that so it is with respect to the great, but still minor blessing, of the salvation of the soul only? Why else our missionaries to pagan lands, and our missionary societies to send them there? Is it not because we know that there will not be salvation through Christ if there continue to be a degading, embruting service rendered to idols? So, in order that the full salvation for the body of which I speak may be attained, God has ordained that there shall be a thorough union in the Christian Church, and the general adoption of divine services in which not merely the thoughts of the worshippers are to be rightly disposed by the Holy Spirit acting in and with the ministry, but in which the actual words of the worshipers are to be dictated by the mouth of God himself. There are other conditions of the law of life, scriptural, reasonable, and glorious, that I am prepared to lay before the proper tribunal, when called upon to do so, which must by their nature remove all the evils of society and of mankind. But, this is not the place nor the occasion. While the Christian religion continues to be a system of what is denominated orthodox doctrine, as to the nature of which sects will differ and dispute forever, to contemplate a union among the various bodies would be a vain dream;

but when mankind shall be compelled to acknowledge that health, strength, and life, accompanying superior holiness and righteousness may flow from the teaching, prayers and action of the Church, conferring literal immortality upon its members, the thought of disunion will be viewed as having the nature of suicide, and be shunned as death. Then, indeed, wars will cease in all the world. They will beat their swords into plowshares and their spears into pruning hooks—the lion will lie down with the lamb, and the leopard with the kid. They will neither hurt nor destroy in God's Holy Mountain, and earth will be Paradise Restored : “The restitution of all things.”



MEMORANDA

OF

PARTICULARS RESPECTING THE PARLIAMENTARY CAREER OF

JOHN ASGILL, Esq., M. P.



HE Journals of the Parliaments of the Two Kingdoms are printed in "Blue Books," and are preserved in large volumes to be lasting records of the proceedings of the Legislature. From these the particulars which follow are taken.

In the Journals of the House of Commons in Ireland, the volume which is lettered on the back as running from A. D. 1693 to 1713, Part I, Vol. II, we find the first mention of our author at page 214. And in the list of members returned to the House which met the 21st of September, 1703, in the second year of the reign of Queen Anne, is the following entry :

"Borough Enniscorthy :

MORLEUS SANDERS, Armiger.

JOHANNES ASGILL, Armiger, [*Expulsus*].

WILLIELMUS BERRY, Armiger, [*Loco ASGILL*]."

At page 317 we have the following:

"A motion being made that a book entitled 'An argument proving that, according to the covenant of eternal life revealed in the Scriptures, man may be translated into that eternal life without passing through death'

Several
paragraphs
of a
book read.

although the human nature of Christ himself could not be thus translated till he passed through death.'

Resolved, *namine contradicente*, that the said book contains in it several heretical and blasphemous doctrines and positions contrary to the Christian religion and the established doctrine of the Church of Ireland, and destructive of human society.

Which are
voted heretic-
al and
blasphemous.

Ordered that the said book be burnt by the hands of the common hangman, before the gate of this House, on Wednesday next, at twelve of the clock, and before the Tholsel, at one of the clock, the same day, and that the Sheriffs of the City of Dublin be required to see the same done accordingly.

To be burnt.

The House being informed that John Asgill, Esq., a Member of this House, is author of the said book,

Mr. Asgill, a
Member,
the author.

Ordered that Mr. Asgill (being now out of town) do attend in his place on Monday fortnight, to answer the said matter."

To attend in
his place.

We next find the subject brought forward on Monday, 10th of October, 1703, at page 333, in the manner following, viz. :

"Then the House, according to the order of the day, heard Mr. Asgill, a Member of this House, on an information against him that he is the author of a book entitled 'An argument proving that according to the covenant of eternal life revealed in the Scriptures, man may be translated into that eternal life without passing through death, although the human nature of Christ himself could not be thus translated till he passed through death.' And having examined several witnesses touching that matter, and having heard what Mr. Asgill could say in his own justification, and he having withdrawn;

House hears
Mr. Asgill
in his place,

and examine
witnesses.

Mr. Asgill
withdraws.

Resolved, *namine contradicente*, that John Asgill, Esq., a Member of this House, is author of said book.

Resolved that
he is
the author.

Resolved, *nemine contradicente*, that John Asgill, Esq., a Member of this House, be expelled this House, and be ever hereafter incapable of being chosen, returned, or sitting a Member in any succeeding Parliament in this kingdom.”

Expelled,
and incapable
of being
returned.

While this action hostile to Asgill grew out of his book, and was taken against him by the House, we think it well to state, that, his return for the Borough for which he sat was disputed by a rival candidate, Mr. Francis Harrison, who forwarded a petition against Mr. Asgill's retention of the seat, and demanded a new election, which might afford him redress. However, on the expulsion having taken place, Mr. Harrison asked leave to withdraw his petition; and at page 334 of the journal, under the date of October 14th, 1703, we read,

“Ordered that Mr. Speaker do issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown, to make out a writ to the Sheriff of the County of Wexford for electing a Burgess, to sit in this present Parliament for the Borough of Enniscorthy, in the County of Wexford, in the room of Mr. Asgill, lately expelled this House.”

Warrant
for
Enniscorthy.



JOURNALS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS, ENGLAND.

A. D. 1707. 6. Queen Anne.*(Page 396.)*10TH DAY OF NOVEMBER. MONDAY.

The Speaker acquainted the House that he had received a letter from John Asgill, Esq., (a Member of this House), from the Fleet Prison, complaining that he was detained from attending the service of this House by reason of two judgments executed upon him at the suit of John Holland, Thomas Mathews, and John Wetton, and other mesne process: and that he desired the same to be communicated to the House—which was read to the House, and is as follows, viz.:

Fleet Prison, Nov. 7, 1707.

Sir :

I think it my duty to make known to the House that I am detained from attending their service by reason of two judgments executed upon me by the procurement of John Rice, and Hezekiah Benson, his Attorney. The one at the suit of Thomas Mathews and John Wetton, trustees for the said Rice of lands purchased by him with debentures granted him by Parliament—and, as such, since vested in Her Majesty—and of some other mesne process, from which I had delivered myself by bail, if not disabled by these executions.

I am advised the proper method of advertising the House is by letter to yourself: but if, upon communicating of this, they should please to signify their pleasure for any other way of address, my obedience is ready to their commands.

Sir,

Your most humble servant,

JOHN ASGILL.

To the Right Honourable

JOHN SMITH, Esquire,

Speaker of the Honourable the House of Commons.

Ordered that a committee be appointed to examine the matter of said complaint, and search precedents what had been done for discharge of any Members imprisoned under execution and mesne process, and report the same to the House. And it is referred to Mr. Secretary Harley, Mr. Medlycott, Sir Wm. Drake, Mr. Tempest, Mr. Gwyn, Mr. Lowndes, Sir Henry Colt, Mr. Newport, Sir Robt. Eden, Mr. Freeman, Mr. Montgomery, Mr. York, Mr. Foley, Sir Hen. Gough, Mr. Abercromby, Sir Thomas Hanmer, Mr. Eyres, Mr. Annesley, Mr. Rowney, Sir Rich. Onslow, Mr. Peyton, Sir Rushout Cullen, Mr. Aislaby, Mr. Craggs, Mr. Palmes, Mr. Kendall, Sir John Erskyn, Mr. Bennet, Mr. Moore, Mr. Cowper, Mr. Ward, Mr. Skippon, Sir Godfrey Copley, Sir Walter Yonge, Sir William St. Quintin, Mr. Pulteney, and all the Gentlemen of the Long Robe; and they are to meet this afternoon, at 5 o'clock, in the Speaker's Chamber, and have power to send for persons, papers and records, and to sit *de die in diem*.

ON THURSDAY, 13TH

(Page 398.)

A petition of John Holland, of Brewood, in the county of Stafford, gentleman, was presented to the House and read, setting forth that John Asgill, Esquire, a Member of this House, being indebted to the petitioner was (after great trouble and expense both in England and Ireland for many years) taken in execution in Trinity Term last, when his privilege of Parliament was expired, and he is now in custody; and there is no possible way for the petitioner ever to get any thing from him but by detaining his person; and praying that the House will not allow Mr. Asgill any privilege until he hath made the petitioner satisfaction for his debt.

Ordered that the said petition do lie on the table until the report be made from the committee to whom the matter of the complaint of the said Mr. Asgill is referred.

ON THE SATURDAY FOLLOWING.

(Page 400.)

Sir Henry Dutton Colt acquainted the House that the committee to whom the matter relating to Mr. Asgill (a Member of this House

in prison in the Fleet) was referred, had directed him to make a report thereof. When will the House be pleased to receive it?

Resolved that the report be now received.

Accordingly Sir Henry Dutton Colt reported the matter to the House; and, afterwards, declared the same at the clerk's table, where the same was read, and is as followeth, viz.:

That, the committee had examined the matter of the complaint, (and, also, searched for precedents); and, that, the case and precedents are as follows, viz.:

That it appears upon examination of the High Bailiff and Keeper of the Gatehouse, Westminster, one Elderton, a Bailiff and the Warden of the Fleet, that a warrant was sent from the Sheriff of Middlesex to the High Bailiff of Westminster, dated the 11th of June, 1707, for arresting the said Mr. Asgill at the suit of John Holland for £6,390 debt, and at the suit of John Tayler for £2,500 debt.

That, pursuant to the said warrant, Mr. Asgill was arrested the 12th June aforesaid, by one Elderton, a bailiff to the said High Bailiff of Westminster, and by him detained till the 14th day of said June, and then he delivered Mr. Asgill to the custody of the Gatehouse prison, charged in execution at the suit of the said John Holland and John Tayler. That the said Mr. Asgill, 23d October, 1707, was removed by *Habeas Corpus* from the Gatehouse to the prison of the Fleet, then charged with actions upon mesne process at several persons' suits in the sum of £2,284, and on executions in the sum of £9,890, as by the original return annexed to the said writ of *Habeas Corpus* appeared.

Then the committee proceeded to search for the precedents of the methods of proceedings which this House has used in cases of privilege, and the method of freeing their Members under arrests, which, in point of time as they stand upon the journals of the House, are, viz.:

The first precedent is the case of Sir Thomas Shirley, in 10 Jacobi, as follows, viz.:

Being a Member of the House, he was arrested. But the House resolved that he should have his privilege; and, when the goaler

refused to surrender him, the King himself interfered, and Sir Thomas was brought into the House.

The second case was that of Sir William Bamfield, who was in like manner liberated, and brought into his place in the House.

The third precedent was Sir John Prettyman's case, who was also liberated.

The fourth precedent was Sir Robt. Holt's case, who was, also, liberated.

On which it was ordered that the report be taken into consideration on Monday morning next.

(See page 440.)

On that day the order of the day being read for taking into consideration the report relating to Mr. Asgill (a Member of this House) in prison in the Fleet:

Ordered that the Sergeant-at-arms attending this House do go with the Mace into Westminster Hall and the Courts there, and Courts of Requests and places adjacent, and summon the Members there to attend the service of the House.

And he went accordingly ;

And being returned,

The report relating to the said Mr. Asgill was read.

Ordered that the report be recommitted.

The House being informed of a printed book or pamphlet signed J. Asgill, intituled, "An argument proving that, according to the Covenant of Eternal Life revealed in the Scriptures, man may be translated into that eternal life without passing through death, although the human nature of Christ himself could not be thus translated until he passed through death," several paragraphs whereof are contrary to and reflecting upon the Christian religion:

The book was brought up to the clerk's table, and the title and several paragraphs therein read.

Ordered that it be referred to a committee to inquire into the Author of the said book.

And it is referred to Mr. Harley, Mr. Jervoise, Lord Powlett, Mr. King, Sir Humphrey Mackworth, Sir Thomas Littleton, Mr. Plumptree, Mr. Rowney, Mr. Manley, Mr. Trotman, Sir John Spencer, Mr. Bridges, Mr. Morgan, Sir Charles Turner, Mr. Montgomery, Mr. Southwell, Mr. Erskin, Mr. Bennett, Mr. Bromley, Sir John Erskin, Sir Henry Gough, Mr. Wentworth, Sir John Mordant, Sir Henry Dutton Colt, Sir Wm. Whitlock, Sir Edward Turner, Sir Richard How, Sir Thomas Burnet, Mr. Ward, Mr. Sharp, Mr. Windsor, Sir Wm. Drake, Mr. Annesley, Mr. Brydges, Mr. Conyers, Mr. Cæsar, Mr. Powlett, and they are to meet in the Speaker's Chamber, and to sit *de die in diem*, and to have power to send for papers, persons and records.

ON WEDNESDAY, 26TH NOV. 1707.

Mr. Harley reported from the committee who are to examine who is the author of the book intituled "An Argument proving that according to the Covenant of Eternal Life revealed in the Scriptures, man may be translated from hence into that eternal life, without passing through death, although the human nature of Christ himself could not be so translated till he had passed through death," that they had directed him to move that it may also be inquired into who was the printer and publisher of the said book; and may also report what passages are therein that are contrary to and reflecting upon the Christian Religion.

Ordered that the said committee do examine accordingly.

(Page 440.)

ON THE NEXT DAY, THURSDAY, 27TH NOV.

Mr. Speaker acquainted the House that he had received a letter from Mr. Asgill in relation to the book under examination, and the same was read and is as followeth, viz.:

Fleet, Nov, 26, 1707.

Sir:

Observing your votes for enquiring into the author of a book signed with my name, I think it my duty to prevent the House loss of time in that enquiry. What I wrote I am ready to produce and recognize whenever the House please to admit me to answer it in any place, and not doubting but they will adjudge my right to that

admission. I hope they will please to respite any further censure upon it till then.

Sir,

Your most humble servant,

JOHN ASGILL.

To the Right Honourable

JOHN SMITH, Esquire,

Speaker of the House of Commons.

Ordered that the said letter do lie upon the table until the report be made from the committee to whom the said book is referred.

[Afterwards there was much procrastination of the subject, but after several postponements.]

ON TUESDAY DEC. 16TH

The House (according to order) proceeded to take into consideration the report of the committee, to whom a former report was committed, who were appointed to examine the matter of the complaint of John Asgill, Esquire, a Member of this House, that he was detained from attending the service of the House, and who were to search precedents what hath been done for discharging any Members imprisoned upon execution and mesne process. And the report was read and is as follows, viz.: [The report, which follows, runs through the large folio pages of the 15th volume, 467, 468, 469, and the greater part of 470,] and, when it was read, it was

Resolved, that, John Asgill, Esquire, (delayed a prisoner in the Fleet), ought to have the privilege of the House as a Member thereof.

Resolved, that John Asgill, Esquire, be delivered out of the custody of the Warden of the *Fleet*, to attend the service of this House.

Resolved, that John Asgill, Esquire, be delivered from such custody, by sending the Sergeant-at-Arms, attending this House with the Mace, to bring him up to the service of this House.

Resolved, that the House will, upon Monday morning next, take into consideration the report from the committee who were to examine who was the author, printer and publisher of a book

entituled "An argument proving that according to the Covenant of Eternal Life revealed in the Scriptures, man may be translated from hence into that eternal life without passing through death, although the human nature of Christ himself could not be so translated till he passed through death." And then the House adjourned.

(Page 470.)

ON THURSDAY, 18TH DECEMBER.

The House proceeded to take into consideration the report of the committee to whom was referred to examine who was the author, printer and publisher of a book entituled "An argument proving that according to the Covenant of Eternal Life revealed in the Scriptures, man may be translated from hence into that eternal life without passing through death, although the human nature of Christ himself could not be so translated till he had passed through death," and to report such passages as are contrary to and reflecting upon the Christian religion.

And the report was read, and is as followeth:

"That, the committee having summoned several persons before them, in order to the discovery of the author, printer and publisher of said book,

Mr. John Darby, a printer, said, that, he was sent for this morning by Mr. Asgill, and when he came to him, Mr. Asgill was writing a letter which, when he had finished, he read over to him, and then enclosed it in one of the second impressions of his book and desired him to deliver the same to the chairman of this committee.

Which letter was read to this committee, and is marked A.

The said Darby said, that, he printed the first impression of the book inclosed in the said letter, having the copy from Mr. Asgill, to whom he gave no consideration for it, but that what books Mr. Asgill had he paid for; and that Mrs. Abigail Baldwyn published the said book for him.

Robert Stevens, the messenger to the press, said, upon sight of one of the said books, that Mr. John Darby was the printer, and Mrs. Abigail Baldwyn was the publisher thereof.

Then the committee took into consideration what passages are used in said book contrary to and reflecting upon the Christian religion; which they find to be as followeth, viz :

*Page 7th** ‘ Now the assertion of Christ concerning himself was that man by him may live forever. And this is that magnetick which hath drawn all the world after him.’

Page 8th.† ‘ Now if these words of his are words only, then was he an impostor and his doctrine is false.

‘ But if this assertion of himself be true, that, man by him may live forever, then all our attempts beneath this are mean and cowardly, as counting ourselves unworthy of eternal life.’

Page 24th.‡ ‘ Such was the death of Christ, without a precedent, without a name, without a reason, without a cause: ‘ They hated me without a cause.’ But they were all against him because God was against him.’

Page 35th. ‘ Had Christ thus become man, and died, and rose again, all voluntarily to try an experiment, he had only saved his own life, and left all the world to shift for themselves.


‘ But this would have been Knight-errantry in tempting God—against which he hath sufficiently declared himself.’

Page 36th.§ ‘ The Devil told Eve, that, they might eat, and not die.

‘ And these were the first words spoken to man by God or the Devil; upon the truth or falsehood whereof the very Beings of them both were to depend forever: for which ever of them could maintain the truth of his word against the other, he must have been God, and the other the Devil.

‘ And, therefore, God having turned the lie upon the Devil, he is from thence called a liar from the beginning, and the father of it, and will never be believed again forever.

‘ God could not have dispensed with his word without complimenting the Devil with his Godhead in taking the lie upon himself. And this he could not do—for God cannot lie without undeifying himself; and this he can’t do, because all his qualities being of his essence he can’t change them.’

 *In this volume the folios are necessarily different in arrangement from the original work; they will be found on reference pages *62, †62, ‡72, §78.*

*Page 51st.** ‘And after that it was no matter to man whether Christ had ever given satisfaction to God or not. We might have said to God, *Look thou to that.*’

Page 78th.† ‘We don’t think ourselves fit to deal with one another in human affairs till our age of one-and twenty. But to deal with our Maker thus offended, to counter-plot the malice of fallen angels, and to rescue ourselves from eternal ruin, we are generally as well qualified for before we can speak plain as all our life time after.’

Page 82.‡ ‘But what is it that you do, or would believe of him, or in him?’

‘*Why, we believe him for our Saviour.*’

‘Save you from what?’

‘*Why! from our sins.*’

‘Why, what hurt will sin do you?’

‘*Why, it will kill us.*’

‘How do you know?’

‘*Why, the law of God saith so: ‘In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt die!’*’

‘Why, but then will not the Saviour save you from this law, and from this death?’

‘*No, no. He’ll save us from sin?*’

‘Why then it seems you’ve got a pardon for horse stealing, with a *non obstante* to be hanged.’

‘Do but see now, what a jest you have made of your faith. And yet I defy the order of priesthood to form a better creed than this, without admitting the truth of my argument; or to make sense of their own faith without adding mine to it.

It is much easier to make a creed, than to believe it after it is made.’

Page 95.§ ‘But when that is done, I know no business I have with the dead; and, therefore, do as much depend that I shall not go hence by returning to the dust—which is the sentence of that law from which I claim a discharge—but that I shall make my exit by way of translation, which I claim as a dignity belonging to that degree of the science of eternal life, of which I profess myself a graduate, according to the true meaning and intent of the covenant of eternal life revealed in the Scriptures.

And if, after this, I die like other men, I declare myself to die of no religion.’

Page 98. ‘Therefore, to be even with the world at once, he that wonders at my faith, I wonder at his unbelief.’

‘And, stare at me as long as you will, I am sure that neither my physiognomy, sins, nor misfortunes, can make me so unlikely to be translated as my Redeemer was to be hanged.’”

Then John Asgill, Esquire, was heard in his place in relation to the said report concerning the said book.*

And the title of the said book was read.

Resolved, that in the book intituled, “An argument proving that according to the Covenant of Eternal Life revealed in the Scriptures, man may be translated from hence into that eternal life without passing through death, although the human nature of Christ himself could not be thus translated till he had passed through death,” are contained many profane and blasphemous expressions highly reflecting upon the Christian Religion.

Ordered, that the said book be burnt by the hands of the common hangman, in the new Palace yard, Westminster, upon Saturday next, between the hours of 12 and 1, and that the Sheriffs of London and Middlesex do assist the Sergeant-at-arms attending this House in seeing the same done.

A motion being made, and the question being put, that the House be adjourned till to-morrow morning, at 9 o’clock,

The House divided.

The noes go forth.

Tellers for the yeas,	{ Sir Henry Dutton Colt, }	- - - -	109.
	{ Mr. Duckett, }		

Tellers for the noes,	{ Mr. Freeman, }	- - - -	165.
	{ Mr. Herne, }		

So it passed in the negative.

Ordered that the candles be brought in:

And they were brought in accordingly.

|| See folio 112. * For report of Asgill’s speech in defence, see page 45.

Resolved, that, John Asgill, Esquire, having in his place owned himself to be author of the said book, be expelled this House.

(Page 476).

FRIDAY, 19TH DEC., 1707.

Ordered, that Mr. Speaker do issue his warrant to the Clerk of the Crown to make out a new writ for electing a Burgess to serve in the present Parliament for the Borough of Bramber, in the County of Sussex, in the room of John Asgill, Esquire, expelled this House.



MR. ASGILL'S

DEFENCE OF HIS "ARGUMENT."

BEFORE THE ENGLISH HOUSE OF COMMONS.



MR. SPEAKER:

This day calls on me for something I am both inapt and averse to, *preaching*. I appeal to my conversation whether I used to make that the subject of my discourse. Having been asked, more than twice, by friends and foes, how such a thing could come into my head? I have intended, as far as I can, to make as candid a narrative as I can of the historical part of this production. How it came into my head: I thank God I had a religious education by honest parents, from whom I early learnt the letter of the Scripture.

But, about the time of my admission to the bar, I met with a great loss from an adventure which I made with an intent to have raised my fortune. This compelled me to a voluntary confinement to my chamber in the Temple for some years; where, with some books of the law, I had a book of Law and Gospel—both of which they call the Bible. And upon some reviews of it, I observed several things which I had not before. And more especially that particular text from whence I traced out this argument as warranted from it—as I really did and do believe:

“I am the resurrection, and the life; he that believeth in me, though he were dead, yet shall he live: and he that liveth and believeth in me shall never die.”

And thus this thought first “came into my head.”

I was long afraid of my own thoughts, lest they were my own only, and as such a delusion. However, I began to try them with pen, ink and paper. And thinking, as I wrote, that they seemed plainer and plainer every time I went over them, I resolved to form them into an argument, to see how they would bear upon the proof: till at last I had transcribed what I am now accused of. But writing an ill hand, I resolved, as a further experiment, to see how what I had wrote would look in print. On this, I gave the printer my copy, with money for his own labor, to print off some few for myself, and keep the press secret. But, I remember, before he got half way through, he told me his men fancied I was "a little crazed." In which, I also fancy, he spoke one word for them and two for himself. However, I bid him go on. And at last, it had so raised his fancy, that, he desired my leave to print off one edition at his own risk—saying, he thought some of the Anabaptists would believe it first, or some such word. Being just then going to Ireland, I permitted him, with this injunction, that he should not publish them till I was clear out of Middlesex. Which I believe he might have observed: though, by what I heard afterwards, they were all about town by the time I got to St. Albans—and the book was in Ireland almost as soon as I was, with a noise after me that I was "gone away mad." And there I received the first rebukes of my friends, and, amongst the rest, that it would prevent my practice. But, as it really happened, I think it promoted it. For people coming into court to see me as a monster, and hearing me talk like a man, I soon fell into my share of practice. But having laid out my acquisitions in a purchase, and being chosen a Member of that House of Commons, and the session being began while I was in Munster, I met the news on the road that my book was burnt by the order of the House. Then I knew all the rest. However, I took the oath and my place in the House till I was expelled in four days. And about four days after a petition was delivered to the House against me, as having purchased Lord Kenmare's forfeited estate (with my own money) for some other people. But they could not tell who, and so their petition was rejected, and their evidence laughed at. But by this I found that I was not expelled the House for my book, but for my bargain, which some thought too good for me; good or bad, I bought it fairly, and got the

money honestly. But I can observe some of the same persons that had a hand in that petition now are soliciting in your lobby, with my book about them. Thus have I traced it into my head, and out of my head, and into Ireland, and back again into your lobby. And how it came into this House, and just at this time too, your worthy chairman knows best.

This is now the fourth Parliament in which I have had the honour to be a Member of this House with that gentleman, since I published this argument, which hath not remained a secret. However that be, I am now called on to answer. And I do acknowledge the justice and candor of this House in admitting me to that defence before they proceed to any further censure than the report of the committee. Which is what I was prevented to do in another House, who having condemned and executed the book without hearing me, there was nothing left between that and my expulsion but to prove me the author. Which no one can think I intended to disown, when I had published it with my name to it. Yet, as it happened, I then had an opportunity to put them to the proof of it. The printer, having sold off his first edition, broke up the press, and the demand for more putting him to the production of a second, he committed in that above thirty erratas from the first. My accuser in Ireland, having one of this second edition in his hand, demanded of me a categorical answer, *whether I was the author?* To which I replied, that, I was author of a treatise upon that argument, and that, if I must be categorical, what he showed me was not a print of my copy; and, therefore, since he accused me of a crime higher than high treason—blasphemy, I did demand it as justice of the House that they would not admit less evidence to convict me of this crime than if I stood indicted for high treason. Upon this stood up two volunteer evidences. The first was a gentleman of the law, at whose house I dined at my first coming to Ireland, about three years before—where I never was either before or after—and his evidence was, “*that there was some jocular discourse about a book.*” The other was a Member, with whom I had a suit at law, and his evidence was, that, “*I had turned about upon my heel, and said ‘I had wrote a book, and did not care who knew it.’*” And upon this evidence I was expelled that House for blasphemy! However, I find the

report of the committee, now before me, is not levelled at the argument itself which I have advanced, nor yet at the treatise which I published to prove it, but against some expressions which I have used in the proof, and to which I intend to give particular answers.

But there is something else laid to my charge of a higher concern to me—as if I had wrote it with a malicious intention to expose the Scriptures as false, because they seemed to contain what I asserted, and that if that assertion did not hold truth the Scripture must be false. Now whether this was my intention or not there is but one witness in heaven or earth can prove, and that is He that made me, and in whose presence I now stand, and who is able to strike me dead in my place. And to Him I now appeal for the truth of what I protest against: that, I never did write or publish that argument or treatise with any intention to expose the Scriptures. But, on the contrary, though I was aware that I might be liable to that censure, and which I knew not how to avoid, I did both write and publish it under a firm belief of the truth of the Scriptures, and with a belief (under that) that what I have asserted in that argument is within that truth. And if it be not, then I am mistaken in my argument; and the Scripture remains true. Let God be true, and every man a liar. And having made this protestation, I am not much concerned whether I am believed in it or not. I had rather tell a truth than be believed in a lie at any time. But 'tis time for me to come to the report itself. And I do own that in that treatise I have used some familiar expressions of common things. This I did with intent to be sooner read and more readily understood. Men of the world being in this thing like children, most affected with what is spoken in their own dialect. Hence, Paul excuseth himself not only for common, but rude expressions: “I am rude in speech, but I speak after the manner of men.” And having thus guarded myself by this general protection, I will go over every paragraph in the report, and give some particular answer to what I apprehend to be the exceptions taken to them.

*The first paragraph excepted to is in page 7:**

“Now the assertion of Christ concerning himself was, that man by him may live forever. And this is that magnetick which hath drawn the world after him.”

* Page 62 of this volume.

Now, had the worthy chairman but taken in the two next paragraphs he would have found an instance of what I said in our Saviour's own disciples, who, when he asked them whether they also would leave him? for reply, they asked him, again, "whither shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life."

*The second is in page 8:**

"Now if these words of his are words only, then was he an impostor, and his doctrine is false. But if this assertion of himself be true, that man by him may live forever: then all our attempts beneath this are mean and cowardly, as counting ourselves unworthy of eternal life."

Answer—From whence the worthy chairman was pleased to say that I called our Saviour an impostor; whereas, what I said was, that if our Saviour's words were not true, they were false. And I insisted that they were true—the whole drift of my argument was that we should depend on his word as true.

The third is in page 24:†

"Such was the death of Christ—without a precedent, without a name, without a reason, without a cause: 'They hated me without a cause.' But they were all against him because God was against him."

Here I must apply the objection to the last clause, "They were all against him, because God was against him."

Answer—Now, if this saying wants any explanation from me, I did and I do mean it: that the will of God was so determined and resolved on the offering up of the eternal sacrifice of his own Son as a ransom for the world, that all the power in heaven and earth could not oppose it: "Father, if it be thy will, let this cup pass from me." But, it is evident, it was not his will, for the cup did not pass from him. And if this evidence will not suffice the worthy chairman without an express statement that God was against his Son, I can quote him two in one text: "Awake O, sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of Hosts." Now I leave it to the worthy chairman to find out another fellow for the Lord of Hosts but that Emmanuel, and if he cannot, then I have proved the assertion that "God was against him."

*The fourth is in page 30:**

“Men charge God as a humorist (*i. e. trifler*) for condemning the whole race of mankind for so small an offence as eating a little forbidden fruit.”

Here the objection seems to be to the word humorist. As to that, I am not setting up for an informer, nor did I ever hear any man or woman call God a humorist—nor have I said that I did. But, following some men into their familiar conversations, we hear this sacred history of the fall treated as a romance rather than a sacred record—and in consequence, I have employed the word humorist; and I am justified, in that Paul used a harder expression than this: “The foolishness of God.” In short, the Apostle finding men in their conversations treating the sacrifices and ceremonies of the Mosaical law as trivial and insignificant things, and thence seeming to charge God with folly in commanding them, therefore, to answer them in their own language, he told them that what they thought foolishness was wiser than all their wisdom: “The foolishness of God is wiser than the wisdom of man.” And I, to imitate Paul in the best way I could, and turn the fool upon man, spoke as I did: “That, according to the laws of honour and gratitude, the lighter the thing demanded is, the greater the affront in refusing it.”

But, by cutting text and paragraphs into two, the worthy chairman might have charged the penmen of the Scripture itself with blasphemy.

The fifth is in page 35:

“Had Christ thus become man, and died, and rose again, all voluntarily, to try an experiment, he had only saved his own life, and left all the world to shift for themselves. But this would have been Knight-errantry in tempting God, against which he had sufficiently declared himself.”

Now, I cannot conceive what is excepted to in this argument at least. So I must suppose it lies against the word “*Knight-errantry*,” Which is the hazarding of a man's person, only to show his parts or actions to the spectators, without doing any good by it either to them or to himself. And a piece of knight-errantry of this sort was once

proposed to our Saviour by the devil: “If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down; for it is written, ‘He shall give his angels charge over thee, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone.’” But our Saviour convicted this to be false logic—as a false conclusion drawn from true premises. For that though Christ was the Son of God, and that what the devil had quoted of him from the Scripture was true, that, “the angels had charge over him,” yet the conclusion was of the devil’s own making—that he might, in confidence thereof, cast himself down headlong—and was false; which our Saviour proved by the quotation of another text: “It is written, again, ‘Thou shalt not tempt the Lord thy God.’”

Thus I have sufficiently proved that our Saviour declared himself against knight-errantry in tempting God. The expression itself is only an abstract in two words of what would have required several lines to define at large.

The sixth is in page 36:‡

“God told Adam that, *if he did eat, he should die*. The Devil told Eve, that, *they might eat, and not die*.

“And these were the first words spoken to man by God or the Devil; upon the truth or falsehood whereof the very Beings of them both were to depend forever. For which ever of them could maintain the truth of His word against the other, he must have been God, and the other the Devil.

“And, therefore, God having turned the lie upon the Devil, he is from thence called a liar from the beginning, and the father of it, and will never be believed again for ever.

“God could not have dispensed with his word without complimenting the Devil with his God-head, in taking the lie upon himself; and this he could not do: *for God cannot lie* without undeifying himself; and this he can’t do, because all his qualities being of his essence he can’t change them.”

Answer—Now as to the fact of what God said to Adam, and the Devil to Eve, I had it out of Genesis. And all that I need descant upon it is no more than that God is true and cannot lie; and that he will not give his glory to another. A truth too plain to be called an argument.

‡See folio 78.

The seventh is in page 51.³

“And after that it was no matter to man whether Christ had ever given satisfaction to God or not; we might have said to God, *Look thou to that.*”

Answer—The argument here is, that, God having accepted Christ as a ransom for the world, man, according to the laws of ransom, was legally discharged from his captivity the very moment that the ransom was given in exchange; and man, after that, could never by any law of reprisal be taken, whether the ransom had escaped, or not given God satisfaction. As to the words “look thou to that,” it might in the case have been said by one man to another. And God, in condescension to human understanding, permits man to use this kind of reasoning with him—saying, “Come now, and let us reason together.”

And he, elsewhere, declares his aversion to informers who watch for iniquity, and make a man “an offender for a word.”

The eighth is in page 78.⁴

“We don’t think ourselves fit to deal with one another in human affairs till our age of one-and-twenty. But to deal with our Maker thus offended, to counter-plot the malice of fallen angels, and to rescue ourselves from eternal ruin, we are generally as well qualified for before we can speak plain as all our life time after.”

Answer—I wish what I have here said was false; but I fear it is generally too true. And I have given my reason for the opinion in the next paragraph, viz.: “Children can say over their religion at four or five years old, and their parents who taught them can do no more at four or five-and-fifty.”

The ninth is in page 82.⁵

“‘This is a full description of the person in whom you place your faith. But what is it that you do, or would believe of him or in him?’

“‘*Why, we believe him for our Saviour.*’

“‘*Save you! from what?*’

“‘*Why, from our Sins.*’

“‘*Why, what hurt will sin do you?*’

“‘*Why, it will kill us.*’

“ ‘How do you know?’

“ ‘Why, the law of God said so : ‘In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt die.’

“ ‘Why, but then, will not this Saviour save you from this law, and from this death?’

“ ‘No, no; he’ll save us from sin.’

“ ‘Why then it seems you have got a pardon for horse-stealing, with a *non obstante* to be hanged.’

“ ‘Do but see now, what a jest you have made of your faith.’ And yet I defy the Order of Priesthood to form a better Creed than this, without admitting the truth of my argument: or to make sense of their own faith without adding mine to it. It is much easier to make a creed, than to believe it after it is made.”

Answer—Now I have not insinuated anything against the common creed of the Christian religion. I merely endeavor to raise it up to the fall. Believing that as the whole humanity fell in Adam, so the whole humanity would be raised in Christ. To expose the contrary, I have used an expression about horse-stealing that may, perhaps, seem rude. But, when we remember our Lord’s comparing himself to a thief, (“the Son of Man so cometh as a thief in the night,”) that he might be more easily understood, I hope my expression of horse stealing, in order to be more easily understood, may not be accounted blasphemy.

The tenth is in page 95. §

“But when that is done, I know no business I have with the dead; and, therefore, do as much depend that I shall not go hence by *returning to the dust*—which is the sentence of that law from which I claim a discharge—but that I shall *make my exit by way of translation*, which I claim as a dignity belonging to that degree in the science of eternal life, of which I profess myself a Graduate, according to the true intent and meaning of the covenant of eternal life revealed in the Scriptures. And if, after this, I die like other men, I declare myself to die of no religion.”

Answer—What is here said in the first paragraphs grows out of my dependence on my argument as well grounded; and as to the last words (of which I have heard so much) that, if I am mistaken

in this dependence, I shall “die of no religion,” I need not have said it. But better to say it, than think it and keep it secret. But that I said it with better hopes, the subsequent passages have explained. In the interim, I hope I live as a Christian; and if I am mistaken, I hope God will reveal even this to me.

*The eleventh and last is in page 98,** (in a sort of postscript I added after my argument):

“Therefore, to be even with the world at once, he that wonders at my faith—I wonder at his unbelief. And stare at me as long as you will, I am sure that neither my physiognomy, sins, or misfortunes can make me so unlikely to be translated as my Redeemer was to be hanged.”

Answer—My accuser, in Ireland, singled out this last word as an *instar omnium* of the blasphemy of all the rest: that I had reported our Saviour to be hanged! And now I’ll answer to this worthy chairman, that my Saviour *was* hanged I cannot deny without being ashamed of the Cross of Christ. Peter, indeed, hath added, on a tree: “Whom ye slew and hanged on a tree.”

Now if it be blasphemy to say our Saviour was hanged, I’ll advance it a degree higher: that he was not only hanged, but that he must be hanged, or else he had not fulfilled the Scriptures. Indeed, the common expression as to the manner of his execution unto death is crucifixion—which was the pain; but that was done by a suspension also—which was the shame; in which shame was concluded the curse of the law which he was to undergo for us: “He was made a curse for us; for cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.”

And as to my wondering at the unbelief of them that wonder at my faith, I cannot but wonder that a man should be expelled two House of Commons, in two Christian Kingdoms, for professing his faith in Jesus Christ according to the Scriptures. However, I must let that pass. But let me ask one question more: Pray what is this blasphemous crime I here stand charged with? A belief of what we all profess, or at least of what no one can deny. If the death of the body be included in the fall, why is not the life of the body

included in the Redemption? And if I have a firmer belief in this than another, am I therefore a Blasphemer? But it grows late, and I ask but one saying more to take leave of my friends with. I do believe that if I had turned this defence into a recantation, I should have prevented my expulsion. But I have reserved my last words as my ultimate reason against my recantation: HE THAT DARES TO WRITE THAT BOOK, DARES NOT DENY IT!



AN
A R G U M E N T

Proving,


That *according to the Covenant of Eternal Life revealed in the Scriptures*, Man may be Translated from hence into that Eternal Life, without passing through Death, altho the Human Nature of *CHRIST* himself could not be thus translated till he had passed through Death.

*Nec vanis credite verbis;
Aspicite en! faciatq; fidem Conspectus.*

Anno Dom. 1700.



PREFACE.

O THEM that knew not the reason, it looked like a whim for the man in the Gospel to walk about the streets with his bed upon his back on the Sabbath-day, while the rest of the people were at their devotion. And, perhaps, it may seem more odd in me to bolt out an Argument in Divinity (as a bone of contention) into the world, at a time when the rest of mankind are so deeply engaged in secular affairs. But he that regardeth the wind will never sow; and he that waiteth for times and seasons, will never do business. And as that seeming whimsical man said to them that reproved him, "He that made me whole, the same said unto me, 'Take up thy bed and walk:'" so say I to them that affront me, "He that revealed this unto me, the same bade me tell it abroad," as a watch-word to be given out from one to another (every man to his fellow) as fast as he receives it: "Let him that heareth say, Come!"

And having thus delivered my part of the Message, I look upon myself to have no more to do with it afterwards than you have.

But, hereby I shall know whether this Doctrine be mine or no: If it be mine, it will sink, and fall and die; but if it be His that I think it is, it will kindle itself like a firebrand, from one to another, till it hath set the world in arms against Death. And, having thus left the decision of the truth of it to the success, I begin to feel myself more easy under it. And as the four leprous men said to one another in the Gate of Samaria: "If we sit here, we are sure

to die with famine, and if we go into the camp of the Syrians, we can but die by the sword:" so, I have said to myself, if I submit to death, I am sure to die; and if I oppose it, I can but be killed and die. And, should I be baffled in this essay, I can lose nothing by it, but that little credit with the world which I value not in comparison of this attempt. And as those four desperate men, venturing themselves upon this resolution, did, thereupon, find that they had been before more afraid than hurt: so, in making this sally against death, methinks I have discovered it to be rather a bugbear than an enemy. And, therefore, as they, having filled themselves with plunder, thought it their duty to go and tell the news to them that were ready to perish: so, I can't satisfy myself to eat my morsel alone, without communicating to them who, I know, (with myself) must, by reason of death, be all their life-time subject to bondage. And as their glad tidings of plenty was nevertheless welcome to the King and People of Israel, for being brought to them by men poor and miserable: so, if my news be true in itself, why should it fare the worse for being told by the greatest of sinners? And perhaps this qualifies me to be the Messenger, lest one more holy should seem to be honoured with it for his own personal sanctity.

I remember a sudden retort once given me by a lady, to whom I excused this my emulation, by the example of Enoch: "But you are not so good as he was; for 'Enoch walked with God.'" And this might have puzzled me, had not Paul (in his List of Worthies) counted upon the Translation of Enoch as done by faith: "By faith Enoch was translated that he should not see death." Why, then, if I have as good a faith for this purpose as he had, I am in this point (*quoad hoc*) as good a man as he was, 'tho I fall short of him in all his other qualities. Nor is it to be expected that any Assembly of Divines should be employed in such a business as this. They in-close themselves within the Pale of their own Church, and whoever breaks through that fence is prosecuted as a trespasser upon their jurisdiction. And thus the Jewish Priests excommunicated a layman for teaching them religion: "'Thou wast altogether born in sin, and dost thou teach us?' and they cast him out."

But He that had opened his eyes, took him in. And such an exchange I should reckon no great misfortune.

But is it not a shame that this Enoch, in the beginning of time—so long before the receipt of the Promise—should attain to that Faith in Christ, which we, that have seen him crucified before our eyes, think a sin to offer at?

But having been tempted to commit this sin, (like a true mother's child of my grandparent Eve), I would tempt my friends to do so too.

And all I ask of them is this:

Having abstracted the study of seven years recluse into less than two hours reading, I only desire the perusal of it at a time of leisure, when men and women design to be serious, and think most of themselves. And then I flatter myself that they will find it not the most unpleasant hour that ever they spent in their life.

For this I know, that nothing is more pleasant to us than News; and what I have said, was never said by man before.

And this I know, that (notwithstanding the defection of our natures) nothing is more pleasant to man than *truth*. And what I have said is true: and a truth that all the gainsayers shall not be able to resist. 'Tho it be in contradiction to the most received truth in the world, that "all men must die."



An Argument proving, That according to the Covenant of Eternal Life revealed in the Scriptures, Man may be Translated from hence into that Eternal Life, &c.



NTE obitum felix nemo, supremaque fata, is a fiction of Poets.

And that old motto, (worn upon tombstones), “*Death is the Gate of Life,*” is a lie! by which men decoy one another into death; taking it to be a thoroughfare into Eternal Life. *Whereas,* it is just so far out of the way.

For die when we will, and be buried when we will, and lie in the grave as long as we will, we must all return from thence and stand again upon the earth before we can ascend into the Heavens. —*Hinc itur ad astra.*

Now the assertion of Christ concerning himself was, “That man by him may live for ever.”

And this is that magnetick [*attraction*] which hath drawn the world after him.

For as he said to us, “Except your righteousness exceed the righteousness of the Scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no wise enter into the Kingdom of God:” so, we may say of him, except his words exceed the words of common men, what should we follow him for?

And thus, when he asked his Disciples if they would leave him, they asked him again, “Whither shall we go? Thou hast the words of Eternal Life;” which no one else pretends to.

Now if these words of His are words only, then was he an Impostor, and his doctrine is false!

But if this assertion of himself be true, "That man by him may live forever," then all our attempts beneath this are mean and cowardly, as counting ourselves unworthy of Eternal Life.

The objection made against him when he affirmed it was, "The custom of the world to the contrary, 'Abraham is dead, the Prophets are dead; whom makest thou thyself to be?'"

And I am not unaware that this custom of the world to die, hath gained such a prevalency over our minds, by prepossessing us of the necessity of death, that it stands ready to swallow my argument whole without digesting it.

For if the custom of bondage derived upon man but for a few generations, doth so inure him to subjection, that he thinks it *jure divino*, and all attempts against it to be rebellion:

How much more may I expect that this attempt against death (which hath had so much a longer possession over man) will be accounted madness!

But as a learned man said, "That the pride of women comes from the baseness of men; and the courage of cowards from others more cowards:" So I may say, that the dominion of death is supported by our fear of it, by which it hath bullied the world to this day.

And, therefore, before I fall upon the direct proof of my argument, I'll offer an answer to the custom of the world against me.

Custom itself, without a reason for it, is an argument only to fools.

Nor can the life or death of one man be assigned as the cause of the life or death of another, unless the same thing happen to them both.

"Abraham is dead, and the prophets are dead." What then?

Why, Abraham died of age, (as the folk call it), he gave up the ghost, being an old man and full of years.

And the prophets were many of them knock'd on the head: "Ye have stoned the prophets."

Must it, therefore, follow that either of these deaths must happen to me, or that because they died of one death, I must die of another?

Suppose my mother died in childbed; must I, therefore, do so too? Or, that my father was hanged; must I, therefore, be drowned?

Abraham is dead, and the prophets are dead. What then?

Why Abraham had a son of his own begetting at a hundred years old, upon a woman of ninety; had an army of men born in his own house; flocks and herds without number, and a whole country of his own to feed them in. And the prophets were favorites of heaven, could raise the dead and kill the living. Must therefore any of these gifts happen to me? Why then, if I must not partake with Abraham and the prophets in their blessings, why must I partake with them in their deaths?

Nor did Abraham die, because the prophets died; nor did the prophets die, because Abraham died.

Then if their deaths had no effects upon one another, why should they have any effect upon me?

And as the life or death of one man, is no cause of the life or death of another; so the multitude of examples don't alter the case.

The life or death of all the world except one man, can be no cause of the life or death of that one man.

Almost this very case once happened in the world, when the flood destroyed all but eight persons; and yet this was no argument that those eight must be drowned too; nor was the preservation of them any argument for the preservation of the rest.

We have heard of a hundred thousand men slain in battle; and yet this was no argument for the death of any other man who was not slain in it.

Wherefore, the custom of the world to die, is no argument one way or other.

But, because I know that custom itself is admitted as an evidence of title, upon presumption that this custom had once a reasonable commencement, and that this reason doth continue, therefore, it is incumbent upon me to answer this custom, by showing

The time and reason of its commencement: and that this reason is determined.

Which if I do show, then the bare custom of the world to die ought no longer to be admitted as a title against life.

First then, I do admit the custom or possession of death over the world, to be as followeth, *viz.*:

That death did reign from Adam to Moses, by an uninterrupted possession, over all men, women, and children, created or born, (except one breach made upon it in that time by Enoch).

And hath reigned from Moses unto this day by the like uninterrupted possession, (except one other breach made upon it in this time by Elijah.)

And this is as strong a possession as can be alleged against me.

To answer this, I must show, that this custom or possession of death had a reasonable commencement, which was the original of it.

To avoid this possession, I must show, that this reason is determined; and that, therefore, this possession ought to be no longer admitted as a title against life.

The religion of the world now is, that "Man is born to die." But from the beginning it was not so; for man was made to live: God made not death till man brought it upon himself by his delinquency.

Adam stood as fair for life as death, and fairer too, because he was in the actual possession of life, as tenant thereof at the will of God; and had an opportunity to have made that title perpetual by the tree of life, which stood before him, with the tree of knowledge of good and evil.

And here 'tis observable how the same act of man is made the condition both of his life and death:

Put forth thy hand, and pull, and eat, and die. Or, put forth thy hand, and pull, and eat, and live forever.

So little doth God esteem the work of man in order to his own salvation.

LORD BACON, descanting upon the fall of man, expresses it thus: "That man made a total defection from God, presuming to imagine that the commandments and prohibitions of God were not the rules of Good and Evil, but that Good and Evil had their own principles and beginnings; and that man lusted after the knowledge of those imagined beginnings, to the end to depend no more upon God's will revealed, but upon himself and his own light as a god: than which there could not be a sin more opposite to the whole law of God."

For 'tis not to be conceived that there was any physical virtue in

either of these trees, whereby to cause life or death; but God having sanctified them by those two different names, he was obliged to make good his own characters of them, by commanding the whole creation to act in such a manner as that man should feel the effects of this word, according to which of the trees he first put forth his hand.

And it is yet more strange, that man having life and death set before him at the same time and place, and both to be had upon the same condition, that he should single out his own death, and leave the tree of life untouched.

And what is further strange, even after his election of death, he had an interval of time before his expulsion out of Paradise to have retrieved his fate, by putting forth his hand to the tree of life; and that yet he omitted this too.

But by all this it is manifest that as the form or person of man, in his first creation, was capable of eternal life without dying; so the fall of man which happened to him after his creation, hath not disabled his person from that capacity of eternal life.

And, therefore, durst man, even then, have broken through the cherubim and flaming sword; or could he now, any way, come at the tree of life, he must yet live for ever, notwithstanding his sin committed in Paradise, and his expulsion out of it.

But this tree of life now seems lost to man.

And so he remains under the curse of that other tree: "In the day that thou eatest thereof, thou shalt die."

Which sentence of the law is the cause of the death of man, and was the commencement of the custom of death in the world as the original of it.

And, by the force of this law, death hath kept the possession (before admitted) to this day.

For 'tho this law was delivered to Adam before Eve was made, and in it there are no express words to bind her, or the issue begotten between them; yet it did not only bind him and her, and all their descendants, but even the whole creation under them; for 'tho this law was delivered to Adam in his single person, yet it was so delivered to him in his politic capacity as head of the whole Creation, and the great trustee for them all.

And thus Adam understood it; for he had told it to Eve, (as a thing that concerned her as well as himself), of which she took notice, and repeated it to the serpent in the dialogue between them.

And as Adam thus understood it, so God declared it immediately after the fall.

“To the woman he said, ‘I will greatly multiply thy sorrow,’ etc. To the man he said, ‘Cursed be the ground for thy sake,’” etc.

And God having thus explained himself, he immediately commanded nature to turn upon man, to execute the sentence of this curse upon them. And under this command nature hath acted ever since, which is an inversion of it from its original institution.

Nature was formed by a law superior to it, (which is called the law of the creation): “Let there be light, and there was light.” And being thus made by a law, God immediately gave it another law to act by; by which the earth watered itself, and brought forth fruit without the labor of man or beast.

But upon man's delinquency, God superseded this course of nature, and put it under another law, whereby the whole creation stands inverted at this day. So that all these common events which now happen in the world, 'tho they are become natural according to nature thus inverted, yet from the beginning they were not so.

Death was a strange word to Adam; for 'tho he did understand it to be a determination of his being, yet he did not apprehend in what manner his being should be so determined, nor how he should make his exit out of the world, having never seen one example of it.

And this made the sentence of death more terrible to them, because they did not know what God was going to pronounce against them.

But God finding the man and his wife hid among the trees of the garden for fear of him, he hinted to them their redemption (by the seed of the woman) in the close of the curse against the serpent, before ever he came to denounce their own sentence against them; which supported them under the terror of it, and without which they had sunk down dead in the place.

And thus, Christ (as he saith) is the life of the world, 'tho they don't know it. For had it not been for this, God had executed man in the fact.

Adam by this very act of delinquency, and the sentence upon it, stood attainted, and became a dead man in law, 'tho he was not executed till about nine hundred years afterwards; and during that interval he begat sons and daughters, and performed all other acts of life.

From which it is observable, that, the change of a man's state, 'tho it doth at one instant ascertain his fate one way or other, yet it doth not work so sudden a change in his person or affections.

Eve after her eating, and Adam before his eating of the forbidden tree, were in two different states from one another—she in the state of death, and he in the state of life; and yet this did not presently change their affections one to another. Which put the case much harder upon him than it was before upon her.

For she by her very creation was made so much a part of himself (from his passion of love to her) that he could not be happy while she was miserable: and hence, perhaps, we read of no other argument she used to him for breach of the command, *than that she had done it before him*.

The violation of her happiness did so much affect him by a sympathy with her, that all his other enjoyments could do him no good. And, therefore, since he thought it impossible for her to return into the same state with him, rather than be parted from her, he chose to hazard himself in the same state with her.

The philosophers say, “man and woman are one creature in two pieces.” And as such God gave them one common name before he made them, “Let us make Man, and let them have dominion,” etc. And this is still retained as a common name to them both in all languages. But their offence was at last joint and several.

Now the articles of the curse denounced against those our common ancestors for this their offence is the law of death, and is the state under which the world stands at this day, and from which we can never be redeemed, but by being discharged from this law.

The falling of which curse upon mankind, as descendants from those our common ancestors, is the foundation of all the laws of man in the like case.

For that parents have power by their own acts to bind their issue before they are born, is the law of all the world: because every man

bath his heirs in him. And thus Levi is said to have been in the loins of his great grandfather, and to have paid tithes in him four generations before he was born.

And thus all the descendants of Esau and Jacob are said to be in their mother's womb, while they were: "Two nations struggled in her womb."

And that the birth of every man within any country doth subject him to the laws of that country, is the law of all nations.

And without these concessions there could be no laws; because else, every man must have a particular law delivered him for himself: which being a public inconvenience, cannot be admitted in the nature of laws.

And, thus, this law of death fell upon Christ himself, as a descendant from the same common ancestors.

Christ had two descents in his birth: one was his natural descent from the Virgin Mary—his real mother. The other, his legal descent from Joseph—his supposed father.

But in his genealogy set down by two Evangelists, this legal descent by Joseph is only counted upon, without taking any notice of his descent by his mother's side: because this descent by Joseph was his legitimate descent, according to that law which makes all the issue of the woman born during the coverture, to be the issue of the husband; although it be notoriously known that, in fact, it were begotten by another.

And this is our law at this day, although the issue be born but one day after the espousals. And the Canon law is much stronger; for that makes the issue born of the woman before marriage (let them be begotten by whom she will, unless by a former husband in wedlock) to be the issue of the husband to whom she is afterwards married.

And, therefore, Christ having such a father in law as this, his descent must be accounted from his father in law, and not from his mother, because all legal descents are accounted from the father, and not from the mother.

When the eleven tribes were polled in the wilderness of Sinai, they gave account of their pedigrees after their families, by the house of their fathers, without taking any notice of their descent

by their mother's side. And so did they of the tribe of Levi, who were numbered after them.

Wherefore, I say, the business of the Evangelists being to show such a descent in Christ, by which the curse of the law might fall upon him in his birth, they must show a descent upon which the law might operate. For as this is a law, all proceedings thereupon are according to law.

And hence it is observable, that his being born of a Virgin espoused, and not of a single Virgin, was not accidental, but designed: for as it was necessary that he should be born of a pure Virgin, to preserve his nature from the defilements of the humanity; so it was necessary that he should be born of a Virgin espoused, to derive upon himself the curse of the law by a legal father. For which purpose it was necessary that the birth of Christ should (in the terms of the Evangelist) be on this wise, and no otherwise.

And as this peculiar genealogy of Christ was not accidental, but designed, the quality of his descent was so too.

There are mutual courtesies and civilities used among equals; but he that accepteth riches or honor from another, doth thereby acknowledge him to be his superior: "for the lesser is blessed of the greater."

Wherefore, when Abraham had rescued the plunder taken from the Sodomites, he permitted the young men that fought with him to eat and drink of the provisions, and his three confederates that assisted him to take their portion of the goods; but for his own part, taking himself to be as good a man as the then King of Sodom, he scorned to accept from him the value of a shoe latchet, "lest it should be said he made Abraham rich."

So, 'tho Christ, in the days of his flesh, behaved himself with all the freedom of conversation—"The Son of Man came eating and drinking;" and when little Zacheus climbed up a tree to see him, he frankly invited himself to dine with him—yet, knowing himself to be the Son of God, he neither could nor would receive any dignity from man: "I receive not honor from man."

And thus, knowing his real descent to be from above—"I am from above"—it was equal to him to be reputed the son of a king or a carpenter.

But he rather chose the latter, because being himself a king—"I am a King,"—he would not accept his immediate descent from another king, lest it should be said that that made him king.

David often vaunted of him as his descendant to come, twice fourteen generations before he was born. "And Abraham rejoiced to see this day."

But he was so far from valuing himself upon these great ancestors—one a king, and the other a king's fellow—that he rather seemed to disown them: "Before Abraham was, I am. If David called me Lord, how am I his son?"

He made no other use of his royal pedigree but to convey by them a corrupted descent from Adam; who standing attainted of treason against heaven, Christ himself under this attainder was baptized in his own blood to restore the rest of mankind into the glorious liberty of the sons of God: for Christ himself, thus falling under the law, became as guilty of the breach of it as any common man, (notwithstanding his personal holiness.)

For we are none of us guilty of this sin in fact, but only by construction of law in the article of our birth, which falls upon us before we know good or evil; and so it did upon the humanity of Christ.

And this law, thus falling upon him, was as just a cause of his death as it is of ours. Nor can his death be assigned to any other cause but this.

This death of Christ was the most unlikely thing that ever happened in the world. His Disciples could not believe it till they saw it.

He did not die of age, being about thirty-three at his death.

He did not die of natural infirmity, having the power of health, by which he preserved his own, and restored others.

He did not die in battle: for his kingdom was not of this world; else would his servants have fought that he should not have been delivered unto the Jews.

He did not die by any sudden accident: "the angels having charge over him, lest he should dash his foot against a stone."

He did not murder himself, but made all his efforts to escape; the greatest of which was his asking his life of God. Nor was he murdered by others, because there was a form of law in doing it.

And yet he was not executed by law; because there was no law then in being by which he could be executed for the crime of which he stood accused.

The time that Christ lived in the world was after the destruction of the Jewish monarchy, and during the continuance of the Roman conquest, under which the Jewish nation, being then subjects, were permitted the exercise of their religion and priesthood, but not of the civil power which they had while their monarchy was in being.

So that if a Jew had committed any offence against the Jewish law, which was not an offence against the Roman law, he was liable to no other punishment than the censure of the Jewish church.

And this was the case of Christ. He, being of the Jewish nation, was accused of blasphemy, which was death by their law; but being not so by the Roman law, the priests were at a loss how to get a formal sentence against him.

And, therefore, when Pilate first demanded of them his accusation, they gave for answer, "Were he not a malefactor, we would not have delivered him unto thee;" expecting to have had him condemned upon their honor: having, indeed, brought him in such a pickle as would have half-hanged any man upon the view.

But we know Pilate's reply to that, and to their accusation when they offered it.

And considering (in the sequel of the history) the warning sent to Pilate by a message from heaven, his own inclinations to obey it, and the former affections of the people towards him, who had their election to redeem him against a common rogue, it seemed impossible that he should have been executed.

Who can assign the cause why Herod and Pilate, Jews and Romans, Priests and People (who were each at odds with one another in other matters) should all fall in together to condemn innocent blood? That the most exact worshipper of God should be accused for a blasphemer! That he that refused to be a king, should be arraigned for a traitor!

Such was the death of Christ—without a precedent, without a name, without a reason, without a cause: "They hated me without a cause." But they were all against him, because God was against him.

And this he told Pilate, without which he declared he would not have surrendered himself: "Wot ye not, that I can even now call to my Heavenly Father, and he shall send me more than twelve legions of angels; but how then shall the scripture be fulfilled?"

His hands were bound, and his feet were in the stocks, that he was not at liberty to defend himself; being fallen under that law which necessitated him to die. And thus his death is exclaimed as equally miraculous with his birth. He was wonderful in his death, like Moses: and who can declare his generation?

All other causes of death are but second causes, which may or may not happen, and against which a man may make his defence. But this general law of death is a flail, against which there is no defence; for if one execution don't reach us, another will: "They that remain of the pestilence shall the sword devour, and they that escape the sword shall be consumed with famine."

Whatever is the immediate cause, is but the executioner to the first command. It was Joab that set Uriah in the front of the battle, and the Ammonites that slew him; but it was David that killed him: "Thou hast killed Uriah the Hittite, and hast slain him with the sword of the children of Ammon."

And having thus shown how this law (which was the commencement of the possession of death over the world) did descend and fall upon Christ, and was the cause of his death, it is next incumbent upon me to show:

That this law is taken away by His death; and, consequently, that the long possession of death over the world can be no longer a title against life.

But, when I say this law is taken away, I don't mean that the words of it are taken away—for they remain with us to this day, and being matter of record must remain forever—but that it is satisfied by other matter of record, by which the force of it is gone.

And I call that law taken away which is satisfied. Law satisfied is no law; as a debt satisfied is no debt.

Now the specific demand of the law was death: and the death of a man: and the death of a man made under the law.

And, therefore, Christ, to qualify himself for this undertaking, became man in the manner and form before mentioned; for had he

assumed the human nature by any other entrance into it, he had not come under the law; and, therefore, could not have been put to answer it: for what the law says, it says to them that are under it.

And, hence, the genealogy of Christ is a fundamental part of eternal life.

For Christ had visited the world once before under the name of Melchisedeck; but not then making his entrance by a father or mother, but assuming the humanity immediately, (like the appearances of angels), the law could not reach him for want of a legal genealogy from Adam, by which it might attain him; and, therefore, he then returned to Heaven without hurt, (as several appearances of angels in the forms of men had done before him.)

But in his coming in the flesh, pursuant to this covenant of eternal life, he took not on him the nature of angels, but the seed of Abraham.

And having thus qualified himself to be a subject to the law, he as such did suffer under it by his death; by which he performed the literal sentence of the law: "In the day thou eatest thereof thou shalt die." Which yet he might have done, and not have given the law satisfaction; for millions of men before him had undergone the literal sentence of the law by dying under it, and yet the law was nevertheless dissatisfied with them and others.

But he declared "It is finished," before he gave up the ghost.

And this is the difference between his death and ours: man dies under the execution of the law, before he can give satisfaction to the justice of it; but this Son of Man gave satisfaction to the justice of the law before the extremity of the execution could reach him.

And this he did by the dignity of his person; for this law was not such a civil contract that the breach of it could be satisfied with money; but it was a law of honor, the breach whereof required personal satisfaction for the most impudent affront, and the highest act of ingratitude to God

Men charge God as a humorist, for condemning the whole race of mankind for so small an offense as eating a little forbidden fruit. But this is their ignorance of the laws of honor and gratitude: by which the slighter the thing demanded is, the greater the affront in refusing it.

Had David asked the inheritance of Nabal's estate, he had rendered himself as odious as Ahab did when he demanded Naboth's vineyard. But his request being only for some ordinary provision, (in common with sheep-shearers), the refusal of it rendered Nabal a churl not fit to live.

(So, Naaman's servant said to his master, "Had the prophet bid thee do some great thing, wouldst thou not have done it? How much more when he only saith, wash and be clean!")

Man by his very creation entered into the labors of God himself, without one thought of his own, and at the first moment of his being became Lord of the Universe, which was adapted to his enjoyments and pleasures.

And God left him in possession of it all, upon his parol of honor only, that he would acknowledge it to be held of God; and as the token of this tenure, that he would only forbear one common tree, (for it seems to be no more till it became otherwise by his eating of it), withal telling him, that if he did eat of it, his life should go for it. Not that God thought his life satisfaction, but it was all the satisfaction God could have of him—it was rather a resentment of the affront, than any satisfaction for it.

By which God showed, that, if man had more than his life to give, God would have had it of him. And, therefore, to signify the height of this resentment, God raises man from the dead to demand further satisfaction of him

Death is a commitment to the prison of the grave till the judgment of the great day; and then the grand *habeas corpus* will issue to the earth and to the sea, to give up their dead; to remove the bodies, with the cause of their commitment: and, as these causes shall appear, they shall either be released, or else sentenced to the common goal of hell, there to remain until satisfaction.

Such was the resentment of despised love; and yet this was a resentment without malice. For as God maintained his resentment under all his love, so he maintained his love under all his resentment.

For his love, being a love of kindness flowing from the generosity of his own nature, could not be diminished by any art of man. And yet his honor being concerned to maintain the truth of his word, he could not falsify that to gratify his own affection.

And thus he bore the passion of his own law, till he had found out a salve for his honor by that Son of Man, who gave him satisfaction all at once by the dignity of his person.

Personal satisfactions, by the laws of honor, are esteemed sufficient or not sufficient, according to the equality or inequality between the persons who give and take the affront.

Therefore, God to vindicate his honor, thus affronted, was obliged to find out a person (for that purpose) equal to himself, who was affronted.

The invention of which is called the manifold wisdom of God—the invention itself being the highest expression of the deepest love—and the execution of this invention (in the death of Christ) being the deepest resentment of the highest affront. Which death of Christ did nevertheless surmount all the demands made upon him.

For as much as his person was superior in dignity to the human nature, so much the satisfaction by his death surmounted the offence of man.

And thus, I say, this law being fulfilled and over-satisfied by Christ in his death, was and is taken away, so that there was no such law in being against him after his resurrection.

He was made under the law by his birth, but he did not arise under it, having taken it away by his death. And having thus taken away the law by his death, the life regained by him in his resurrection was by conquest.

He met with no quarter from God nor man: God would not save him from death, 'tho he asked him; and, therefore, he rescued himself from it.

He prayed to be preserved from death before it came upon him; but he craved no aid against the power of it towards his resurrection: "Destroy this body, and I will raise it in three days." Die he knew he must; but rise he knew he could.

And the reason of his resurrection was, because death could hold him no longer: for it was not possible that he should be held any longer of it.

And this he did, not in contradiction to the will of God: for God having executed the law upon him by his death, he did not oppose him in his resurrection. And, therefore, 'tho he could not come

down from the cross, because the will of God was then against him, yet he could arise from the dead, because the will of God did not then oppose him.

And so, God leaving him to himself, he conquered death. By which, according to all the laws of conquest, the law of death is taken away.

For by the laws of conquest, the laws of the conquered are *ipso facto* taken away by the very conquest: and all records and writings that remain of them are of no more force than waste paper.

The law of death (as I have said) remains in words, and will remain forever; but it had no more force against Christ after his resurrection than if it had never been made. And from hence the title of Christ to eternal life is become absolute.

By absolute, I mean discharged from all tenure or condition, and consequently from all forfeiture.

And this is the title of conquerors, who hold of none but themselves; because they receive their right from none but their arms: and is in opposition to the first title of life delivered to Adam, which was held by tenure, as being received from God; and being so held, it became forfeited to him of whom it was held, according to the laws of tenure.

But Christ receiving his life in his resurrection from none but himself, ("I lay down my life of myself, and I take it up again,") it is now his own without tenure; and therefore is absolute, and cannot be forfeited.

And as his title to life is thus become absolute by conquest: so the duration of it is become eternal, by being annexed to the person of the God-head.

A man may have an absolute title, and yet that title may be but for a time.

Life is called temporal or eternal, according to the persons or things to which it is annexed or united.

The life of vegetables and animals is called a temporal life: because it is annexed to things which have a temporal duration.

And thus, according to our laws, whatever is annexed to the person of a man, is adjudged to have continuance during his life.

So that if land be conveyed to a man indefinitely, without nam-

ing any time how long he shall hold it, he has (without more saying) an estate for life, because his estate is annexed to his person, which is said to have continuance for his life.

And hence the life of Christ, regained by the conquest of his resurrection, being annexed to the person of his Godhead, which is eternal, doth thereby become eternal life: for the life of God and eternal life are synonymous terms.

And thus Christ, ever since his resurrection, did and doth stand seized of an absolute and indefeasible estate of eternal life, without any tenure or condition, or other matter or thing to change or determine it for ever.

And I had reason thus to assert the title of Christ at large.

Because this is the title by and under which I am going to affirm my argument, and to claim eternal life for myself and all the world.

Had Christ thus become man, and died, and rose again, all voluntarily, to try an experiment, he had only saved his own life, and left all the world to shift for themselves.

But this would have been knight-errantry in tempting God; against which he hath sufficiently declared himself.

And yet, when I say he did it voluntarily, I don't mean that he did it unwillingly: for as he did it with all frankness and generosity of his will. ("I lay down my life of myself,") so he did it with the highest affection of love to mankind: "Greater love than this hath no man, that he lay down his life for his friend."

But I mean, he did not do it purely voluntarily, without a necessity of doing it; and a consideration for it.

First then: there was a necessity upon God himself.

God told Adam, that if he did eat, he should die. The Devil told Eve, that they might eat, and not die.

And these were the first words spoken to man by God or the Devil; upon the truth or falsehood whereof the very beings of them both were to depend forever. For which ever of them could maintain the truth of his word against the other, he must have been God, and the other the Devil.

And, therefore, God having turned the lie upon the Devil, he is from thence called a liar from the beginning, and the father of it; and will never be believed again for ever.

God could not have dispensed with his word without complimenting the Devil with his Godhead in taking the lie upon himself; and this he could not do: for God cannot lie without undeifying himself; and this he can't do, because all his qualities being of his essence, he can't change them.

That God cannot change, is not a deficiency in his nature, but the perfection of his essence, which can be nothing but himself. For as it is the happiness of imperfect beings to be capable of change, in order to be made better; so it is the happiness of perfect beings to be incapable of change, whereby to be made worse.

Man can lie, because he can't speak truth; there's nothing that a man can say but what he can unsay and falsify by the change of his mind, which he can change only because he can't fix it: as a man that hath a broken arm can turn it every way, because he can fix it no way.

Nothing but an absolute power can be absolute in any thing; therefore, man having no absolute power, can't absolutely determine his own will; every change of which subjects him to a lie, either by falsifying his former resolutions, or his present inclinations. But God having an absolute power to determine his own will, he could not change it after he had so determined it; for what is fixed can't be changed.

Wherefore, God could not dispense with the breach of his law to pardon it. Which was not for want of mercy in God, for he hath and doth daily pardon ten thousand times the sins committed by man against the moral law, which seem as great offences as this.

Because the moral law hath in itself a defeasance or condition annexed to it at the time of the first delivering of it. ("Except ye repent, ye shall perish.") By which this law may be fulfilled without a performance of it in specie: by doing another thing which is admitted to be done instead of it.

A defeasance is not the same thing with the thing to be defeated, but something collateral to it. And thus repentance, which is not a performance of the moral law, is nevertheless accepted instead of it.

But in this law delivered to Adam, there was no such condition annexed to it at the first delivery. The words are absolute: "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt die;" which leaves no

room for repentance. Adam did repent, but he found no place for it, he could not find any words of the law to which he could apply his repentance to do him any good.

And when a deed hath no defeasance or condition annexed to it at the time of the first delivery, it can't be added to it afterwards.

And, hence, 'tho this law delivered to Adam was at the time of the first delivery a law of life and death, yet the law of life being ended by breach of the condition, there was then nothing left but the law of death, which became absolute without any condition.

And this put God upon a necessity of executing the sentence of the law upon man in specie, or making himself a liar—which he could not do—and therefore the necessity upon him was absolute. Which necessity was (all the while) a contradiction to his nature, which is love to man: “God is love.”

And this divided him against himself, and laid him under a necessity of finding out an invention to reconcile his truth to his love, and his love to his truth.

And this necessity upon God drew a necessity upon Christ to come and execute this invention, because none could do it but himself.

Now, there being such a necessity for Christ's assuming the human nature, and dying under it, there was a covenant made between him and the Father, previous to his coming in the flesh, which is called the covenant of eternal life, and is the history of the scriptures, although it be not set down altogether in any one place.

Rich metals and precious stones don't lie together in heaps above ground; but being so valuable when found, men think it worth their while to dig down for them in all places where they have any probability of finding them.

Then if the way and manner of attaining eternal life, doth lie in so narrow a volume as the bible, (“search the scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life”), shall we not think it worth our while to search it through for that precious stone with a new name, which none can read but they that have it?

And this is a more pleasant labor than the search for other jewels; for there we meet with nothing of pleasure or profit, till we find the very thing we seek for. But in making this enquiry, we divert ourselves with knowledge all the way we go.

Nor did God think any one man, or any one age of the world, worthy to have the whole of this covenant revealed to them all at once. He was four thousand years, from Adam to Christ, delivering it in types and shadows to sixty-two generations of men, who passed their age in that time.

But having thus prefaced it at sundry times, and in divers manners to our fathers by the prophets, he at last spoke it to us by his Son.

In which these parts do appear:

1. *The Date.*
2. *The Parties.*
3. *The Contents and Consideration.*
4. *The Sealing and Execution.*
5. *The Witnesses.*
6. *The Ceremony required of Man, whereby to execute it on his part, and take the advantage of it.*

1. *The Date.* This was before the foundation of the world: "I was set up from everlasting. Before Abraham was, I am." "God who created all things by Jesus Christ, the lamb slain before the foundation of the world."

The priority of which date prevents any preincumbrance that could be made of eternal life: which is more than can be said of any titles amongst men.

2. *The Parties.* It was between Him and the Father: "Lo, I come to do thy will, O, God. In the volume of the book it is written of me, 'I will give thee the Heathen for thy possession, and the utmost parts of the earth for thine inheritance.'"

The first text tells what he came to do, and in pursuance of what agreement. The other, what he was to have for doing it, and who he was to have it from. Now God being the undoubted author of eternal life, there can be no hazard in this title for want of a right person to make the grant: which is more than can be said of any titles amongst men.

3. *The Contents and Consideration.* That if he became bound, we should be made free: "He gave his life a ransom for many."

Christ well knew what man stood bound to under the law of death; and did as well know, that, if he himself ever came under that law, he must thereby become bound to the same; and that if he should come under the law, before he made an agreement previous to it, he should be concluded by the law to suffer under it upon his account, and thereby be incapacitated to capitulate with God about it.

For the life of a man attainted (as Christ was the first moment of his birth) is forfeited to the law; and, therefore, after that he could not have been at liberty to treat with God concerning that law.

And, thereupon, he would not become charged with this law till he had made this covenant: "That we that were before charged with it, might be discharged from it." By which he was to be neither surety nor bail for man.

For in both these the principals still remain liable, and the sureties stand only hazarded with them, and have a remedy over against them. Which had been a dishonorable engagement for the dignity of so great a person.

And, therefore, he offered himself a ransom, or nothing, to be delivered in exchange for the captives; whereby he alone stood bound.

And as such he was accepted: "I have trodden the wine-press alone, and none of all the people with me."

And, therefore, when he was taken, there was not a man taken with him: "I am Jesus of Nazareth whom ye seek, let these therefore go their way."

And this was the highest honor that God could put upon him, to accept him a ransom for the whole world. And yet this was not an honor above his merit: for, as in debts by civil contract, 'tis not the multitude but the solvency of the debtors that makes the payment; so in the laws of ransom, 'tis not the number but the dignity of the persons that is valued in the exchange.

And hence this Son of Man being more worth than ten thousands of the people, his death was a greater honor to the law, than if all the world besides had died under it.

And could man from hence understand the force of the covenant of eternal life, he might see himself discharged from death in the very moment the law fell upon Christ, (which was the instant of his

birth), because man was to be *ipso facto* released upon Christ's becoming bound. And, after that, it was no matter to man whether Christ had ever given satisfaction to God or not: we might have said to God, *Look thou to that!*

For God, by this covenant, having once accepted Christ for a ransom, man could never after that have been retaken by any law of reprisal, although the ransom had escaped. (As soon as the ram was caught in the thicket, the sacrifice that before lay bound upon the altar was let loose.)

Not that the coming of Christ in the flesh was the satisfaction, but, God was thereby sure of his satisfaction. For as certain as Christ by his birth became a living child in fact, so certain did he that moment become a dead man in law.

But yet, all that I have hitherto said doth not amount to instate man into the same title of eternal life which Christ had after his resurrection; because a mere ransom doth in itself amount to no more than to restore us to the same liberty which we had before we were captive.

And then this ransom by Christ would only have reinstated man into that law of life conditional, in which Adam stood before the fall.

But God having found out this *salvo* for his honor by that man Christ Jesus, he did at the same time find that this would not only do but over-do all that man had misdome. And that this superabundancy might not run in waste, God did declare that, for this, man should have eternal life—absolute as Christ himself had it.

And, hence, eternal life is called the “gift of God through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ,” over and above our redemption.

So that now, by this covenant of eternal life, we are not only ransomed from that law under which we fell in Adam, but are delivered over into a state and title which we never had before the fall, *viz.*, that absolute and indefeasible estate of eternal life in which Christ was installed by his resurrection from the dead.

And this redemption from one law, and deliverance over into another, are both done at the same instant, without any interval of time passing between them. As in conveyances amongst men, the title vests and divests, from one to another, by one and the same act.

And, hence, this covenant is not called the covenant of redemption, but “the covenant of eternal life,” as the most worthy title. And, therefore, he that takes anything by this covenant, must take eternal life or nothing.

A believer is never spoken of with a less addition than eternal life: “He that believeth on the Son of God hath everlasting life.”

And thus it is in conveyances among men: whatever is contained in the deed can’t be divided, but must pass altogether by the execution of that deed; which, as to this, now stands next in order:

4. *The Sealing and Execution.* For let the contents of a writing be what it will, it is neither deed nor covenant till it is executed.

This covenant of eternal life being thus formed in Heaven, was afterwards sealed and executed by God himself, according to all the forms and ceremonies of titles among men. For God having established eternal life by a law, he hath used all the ceremonies of law to make a title to it.

Every law prescribes its own ceremonies by which it is to be executed.

The ceremony (as I have said) by which the law of death is executed upon man, is his birth.

The ceremony by which the Jews received the law of Moses was circumcision. And the ceremony by which the covenant of eternal life was executed by God, is the blood of Christ.

And now I am come to that point that hath puzzled the whole world:

“What! *Eat the flesh, and drink the blood of a man, and be saved?*”

That this covenant should be sealed is agreeable to all other titles amongst men. But that it should be sealed with the blood of Christ, seems very peculiar.

And yet we shall find even this also to be most suitable to the common use of seals amongst men.

We cause our seals to be impressed with the most memorable ensigns of honor that can be assigned to our families, whereby they may be remembered, every time the deed is shown. And, amongst these, we esteem those most honorable which are gained in the field with the loss or hazard of our lives.

Why then! here’s the Son of God thrown down from heaven in

the form of a man, as a champion against death and hell, slain in the open field, before the face of men and angels, in the quarrel and defence of his friends. And, after that, displaying himself again, with all his wounds about him: "Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side."

Now, first, I challenge the heroes to show such scars of honor as these. And then, I defy the Heralds to match it for a coat-of-arms. Such a champion, and such a cause; such a combat, and such a conquest!

And, therefore, (of all things in heaven and earth) God hath chosen out the blood of Christ to be the seal of the covenant of eternal life. That as often as man sees the seal of that covenant, he may remember the fate of that day: "As often as ye do this, do it in remembrance of me."

The place of the execution of this covenant was upon earth. (Which instance hath put me upon many thoughts by the bye.)

The first notion of a God is, that he is equal to himself in all his attributes; and it seemeth blasphemy in man, of himself, to suppose any inequality in his Maker.

But God having owned something which he values himself upon more than all the rest, man hath, thereby, leave so to conceive of him. Now, he hath magnified his word above all his name. And in that word he hath bound himself by an oath to perform this covenant: "Once have I sworn by my holiness, that I will not lie unto David."

And of all parts of this, as well as other covenants, the sealing is the greatest solemnity.

This covenant then being sealed by God himself upon this globe of ground, I can't but think that man is to pass through his greatest change in the same place. But I'll say no more of that till I have done my argument.

5. *The Witnesses to the Execution.* And these were first accidental, and they were the whole world: "The sound thereof is gone through the whole earth; for this thing was not done in a corner."

Secondly, The direct Witness, and that was himself: "For this end was I born, and for this end came I into the world, to bear wit-

ness unto the truth." For as he did not depend upon the testimony of John to tell the world who he was, having a greater testimony of his own works; so he doth not depend upon man to witness this covenant, having attested it himself, in his own blood.

And this is after the manner of kings, "Witness ourselves," because they can't have a greater; and like God himself, who swears by himself, because he can't swear by a greater.

6. *The Ceremony by which this Covenant is to be Executed by Man.* This covenant being thus executed by God himself, and attested in the blood of Christ, stands ready to be executed by man on his part.

And this is also agreeable to the forms of title amongst men, who can take no benefit of a deed but by acceptance of it.

We distinguish our deeds by two titles:

1st. AN INDENTURE, in which all the parties must be named.

2ndly. A DEED ROLL, in which the parties need not be named, but are described by the first prescription of the deed: as if the deed begins, "To all persons who shall subscribe these presents;" then every one by his subscription becomes a party, to take the benefit of all that is contained in that deed for the subscribers.

Now in this covenant of eternal life the parties are not named, but every man is so described that he is at liberty to make himself a party to it.

The words of this prescription are:

1. *Positive:* "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life."

2. *Negative:* "Except ye eat the flesh, and drink the blood of the Son of Man, ye have no life in you."

Which prescription doth not respect his blood as blood only, but as that blood is made the seal of this covenant: "This cup is the New Testament in my blood."

We don't seal wax as wax, but as it is annexed to the deed, and made the seal thereof. For the sealing the same piece of wax at large separate from the deed, signifies nothing.

And hence, it is not the wax that sanctifies the deed, but the deed that sanctifies the wax. For if lead or any other malleable

substance be annexed to the deed, and impressed with the seals, it is as effectual as if it were wax.

And, hence, Christ himself doth own that it was the sanction and mission of God upon him that made him the Redeemer of the world: "Say ye of him whom God hath sanctified and sent into the world, that he blasphemeth, because he saith he is the Son of God." * * * "For him hath God the Father sealed." And hence that great cognomen *Christ* is added to his proper name of *Jesus*. And thus the kings of Israel received their sanction by the anointing of the Prophets.

The distinction between things holy and common, sacred and civil, is the appointment of God put upon the one, and not upon the other. The things used in ceremonies are in themselves indifferent and insignificant; but by the sanction of those laws by which they are made ceremonies, they become the most necessary and essential parts of the law.

Such were the things used in the sacrifices of the Mosaical Law, foolish and insignificant in themselves; but being set in order according to the forms of that law, they became sanctions to one another. The gold of the Temple, the wood of the Altar, and the flesh of beasts were all common things till they were used according to the Temple Laws; and then and there the Temple sanctified the gold, and the Altar sanctified the gift.

So 'tis in our law—a writing is nothing, and wax is nothing, and a seal is nothing, they are but cyphers in themselves; but if the wax be put to writing, and the seal to the wax, this makes the writing to be a deed, and is the form of a title.

Men in their private stations may argue with one another *pro* and *con* as long as they please, without doing good or hurt: but the *Ay* or *No* of one of these men given in a Court of Legislature, may turn the fate of a kingdom.

And the more slight and plain these ceremonies are by which titles are executed, the more sure the title is that is to come from them, because they can neither be mistaken nor forgotten.

We think it an extravagant humor in God to distinguish men to be saved or damned, only for believing or not believing in Christ. But, may we not think it as extravagant in us to distinguish our-

selves to have, or not have, a thousand pounds a year, only for sealing, or not sealing a deed.

Should we not call ourselves fools for refusing to put forth our hands to a piece of parchment, and take it off again, to get an estate by? And yet we think ourselves wise in refusing eternal life, because we may have it upon such easy terms.

For 'tho, from the positive words of this prescription, the sealing and executing this Covenant of Eternal life by man (without more saying or doing) gives him as perfect a Title to Eternal Life, as the sealing of a deed among men can make to the lands contained in it, yet, from the negative words of the prescription, there can be no title to this Eternal Life without the compliance with this Ceremony. For if man can have any other title to Eternal Life than according to this Covenant, this Covenant don't give him a title to it.

No deed gives man a title that leaves any part of the title at large out of the deed. If the grantor reserves any of the title to himself, then the grantee hath no perfect title.

But God hath excepted nothing out of this Covenant, but his own Personal Life: "For when it is said, that, 'he hath put all things under him,' it is manifest that he is excepted who hath put all things under him."

Wherefore, all the other parts of Eternal Life are subject to this way of Life by Jesus Christ. And hence, all other attempts for Heaven are accounted sin: "He that entereth not in by the Door, but climbeth up some other way, is a Thief and a Robber, and comes for to steal."

And, having thus opened this Covenant:

First, I put it upon the Profession of Divinity to deny one word of the fact, as I have repeated it.

Next, I challenge the Science of the Law to shew such another title as this.

And then, I defy the Logicians to deny my Argument. Of which this is the Abstract:

That the Law delivered to Adam before the Fall, is the Original Cause of Death in the World.

That this Law is taken away by the Death of Christ.

That, therefore, the Legal Power of Death is gone,

And I am so far from thinking this Covenant of Eternal Life to be an allusion to the forms of title amongst men, that I rather adore it as the precedent for them all; from which our imperfect forms are taken. Believing, with that great Apostle, that, "the things on earth are but the patterns of things in the heavens, where the originals are kept."

But, why then doth death remain in the world?

Why, because man knows not the way of life: "The way of life they have not known."

Or, (as I said at the beginning), that, death maintains its dominion over us by our fear of it. Having no other right to remain with us, but because our faith is not yet come to us: "When the Son of Man comes, shall he find faith upon the earth?"

Man is a beast of burden, that knows not his own strength, in the virtue of the death, and the power of the resurrection of Christ. Which ignorance doth not proceed from want of revelation of the truth, but from our neglect to study, and inaptitude to believe it: "O fools! and slow of heart to believe all that the Prophets have spoken."

Unbelief don't go by reason or dint of argument, but is a sort of melancholy-madness, by which if we once fancy ourselves bound, it hath the same effect upon us as if we really were so.

It is like the noise of war heard in the camp of the Syrians, which made them fly when no one pursued: or like that possession of fear which still kept the besieged within the garrison, 'tho the enemy had left the field.

Death is like Satan, who appears to none but them that are afraid of him: "Resist the Devil, and he will fly from you." Or like tyrants and saucy pedagogues, whose former cruelties render them terrible to those who have been under their lash, after they are freed from it.

Because death had once dominion over us, we think it hath and must have it still.

And this I find within myself, that 'tho I can't deny one word I have said in fact or argument, yet I can't maintain my belief of it, without making it more familiar to my understanding, by turning it up and down in my thoughts, and ruminating upon some proceedings already made upon it in the world.

Some specimens whereof I'll present to the reader :

The motto of the religion of the world is, as I have said, "*Mors janua Vitæ*"—("Death is the gate of life.")

Now, I say, if we do by this mean *the death of Christ*, then we are in the right. But, if by this we mean *our own death*, then we are in the wrong. The death of Christ was necessary for him and us both, because the Covenant of Life would not take effect but by his death; which in the covenant hath two capacities.

1st. As it was the consideration upon which the covenant was made.

2dly. As it was the ceremony by which it was executed.

But all this being over and done, the death of man is wholly useless, and serves to no intent or purpose in order to eternal life, nor ever did.

And could we distinguish between the change of our state, and the change of our persons and places, this doctrine would be more plain to us.

By state, I always mean title; so that when I say a man is in the state of life, I mean he is by law entitled to live; and when I say he is in the state of death, I mean he is by law appointed to die.

Now a man may change his state, without change of his person or place. Christ by his death and resurrection did pass under an invisible change of his state, by being discharged from that law of death to which he stood before subjected by his birth, and being translated into that law of life which he gained by his resurrection.

Which 'tho it were only a legal or invisible translation, he was thereby as safe from death as he is now, being ascended and sitting at the right hand of God. And yet his person remained here unchanged: "*Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I, myself.*" These were marks of honor that could not be counterfeit.

And that some did not know him, is said to be from their unbelief, or that their eyes were holden that they should not know him.

But 'tho this change of his state in an instant, did not work so sudden an alteration in his person, yet it did entitle his person to a change for the better, which title he had not before his death.

Christ was as perfect in his nature and his principles before death as he was afterwards; and yet he could not then make his immediate passage to heaven by way of translation, because he was fallen under that law, which did oblige him to the common fate of death.

But having once suffered this, and thereby, and by his resurrection, delivered himself from that law which had obliged him to it, he then stood perfectly qualified to make his *exit* by way of translation. And, therefore, having done all he had to do upon earth, he claimed a right of re-entrance into his former glory without dying any more: "*I have finished the work thou gavest me to do. Now glorify me with that glory which I had with thee before the world began.*"

And, thereupon, God sent him down one of the chariots of heaven to convey him thither; as he had done before to those two heroes of old—whom I have excepted out of the possession of death—upon this their faith in Him, before they saw him: "*Blessed are they that have not seen, and yet have believed.*"

Now, I say this, that as Christ did thus change his state upon earth, without change of his person or place, so man may do too; with this difference, that 'tho Christ passed this change by his own death and resurrection, yet we can't do it by our own death and resurrection, but must do it by passing through the death and resurrection of Christ in that legal form prescribed by the Covenant of Eternal Life: because his death, and not ours, is made the seal of that covenant.

And this man may do, without any real death or resurrection of his own.

If the death and resurrection of Christ be the passage into eternal life, then he that is passed this, is passed into eternal life; whether he himself ever died or not.

And for us to think to imitate Christ in attaining eternal life by passing through death, because Christ did so, shows us to be as

ignorant of the law of eternal life, as a man would seem of our laws, who seeing another entitled to an estate by sealing of a piece of wax upon a piece of parchment, should think to get the same himself, by doing the same thing upon other pieces of the like, of his own putting together.

For my own part, I thank God, I have already made this so familiar to myself, that could I pass through an actual death and resurrection of my own without pain, I would not value the experiment as anything towards salvation, further than this, that I should thereby know that there is nothing in it. And of this I am as well satisfied by the experiments made upon others, as if it were upon myself.

When Christ had opened the eyes of the man born blind, the people were ready to interrogate him to death: "*What?*" "*How?*" "*Where?*" "*When?*" "*Did he cure you?*" "*What did he say to you?*" "*What did he do to you?*" "*What did you see first?*" "*What did you feel first?*" But he knew no more of the matter than they did: only that, "*Whereas, I was blind, now I see!*"

So, when the people flocked about Lazarus, expecting to hear from him some news of the other world, he could give them no other account of it, than, "*Whereas, I was dead, now I am alive.*" He was neither richer nor wiser by his resurrection, nor could learn by that how to escape another death, but died again: and might have thus died and rose, and rose and died a hundred times, without any change of his state.

Wherefore, Samuel asked Saul, "*Why dost thou disquiet me to bring me up?*" What wouldst thou have with me? Is it to see me? Why here I am, an old man in a mantle, as thou hast seen me a hundred times! Wouldst thou talk with me? Why, thou knowst what I have told thee, over and over, "*The Lord is departed from thee, and hath rent the kingdom out of thy hand;*" and so I tell you now, and more I cannot say!

If men will not believe Moses and the Prophets while they are living, why should we fancy we shall rather believe them when risen from the dead? If they say the same things over again, it is impertinence; and should they contradict themselves, how could we believe them?

We have strange conceptions of death and resurrection as long as we are on this side of them. But when we have once passed through and find ourselves much the same as we were before, we shall be at as much loss about it as we are now.

And if the death of others who have died before us, hath put us into such a fear of death that we shall die too, I can't conceive how our own death should discharge us of that fear after our resurrection, but that it should rather augment it; for what we have once felt, we are ever after more afraid of feeling again: "*The burnt child dreads the fire.*"

And yet far be it from me to say that man may not attain to eternal life 'tho he should die; for the text runs double, "I AM THE RESURRECTION AND THE LIFE; HE THAT LIVETH AND BELIEVETH ON ME SHALL NEVER DIE, AND 'THO HE WERE DEAD HE SHALL LIVE." But this I say, that by this very text there is a nearer way of entering into eternal life than by the way of death and resurrection.

Whatever circumstances a man is under at the time of his faith, God is bound upon his fidelity to make good this text to him, according to which part of it he builds his faith upon.

If he be dead, then there's a necessity for a resurrection. But if he be alive, there's no occasion for death or resurrection either.

Nor doth this text maintain two religions, but two articles of faith in the same religion.

But this I do apprehend, that the article of faith for a present life without dying, is a higher article of faith than that which expects death and resurrection; because I passed through this last article long before the other (which I am now arguing for) ever entered into my thoughts.

I once courted death, as Elijah did under the juniper tree in the wilderness, when he requested for himself to die, and said, "Now, Lord, take away my life, for I am not better than my fathers." Which shews that he was not educated in this faith of translation, *but attained it afterwards by study.*

For no man can comprehend the heights and depths of the Gospel at his first entrance into it. And in point of order, "the last enemy to be destroyed is death.

The first essay of faith is against hell, that 'tho we should die we might not be damned. And the full assurance of this is more than most men attain to before death overtakes them; which makes death a terror to them.

But they that do attain to this assurance before they go hence, can sing a *requiem* at their death: "Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen thy salvation."

And if God takes them at their words, they lie down in the faith of the resurrection of the just. But whenever he pleases to continue them (after this attainment) much longer above ground, that time seems to them an interval of perfect leisure, (as Alexander's did to him after his conquest); till at last espying death itself, they fall upon it as an enemy that must be conquered one time or other through faith in Christ,

And for this cause there seems a respite of time intended to be allotted to believers after the first resurrection, and before the dissolution of the world, for perfecting that faith which they began before their death, and which they could not attain to in the first reach of life. For death being but a discontinuance of life; wherever men leave off at their death, they must begin at their resurrection.

The believers already dead are not ascended into the heavens: "For David is not ascended into the heavens." Nor shall they ascend after their resurrection, till they have attained to this faith of translation. And by that very faith they shall be then convinced that, if they had had that faith before, they need not have died.

The story of Lazarus makes this plain.

His two sisters said to Christ, that *if he had been there their brother had not died*.

And others that stood by said, "Could not this Man, that opened the eyes of the blind, have even caused that this man should not have died?"

And Martha said further, *that whatever Christ would yet ask of God, God would give it him*. By which she declared her faith to be, that Christ could raise her brother presently.

Now these people had not these articles of faith from any religion

then commonly received amongst them. But observing the miracles Christ had done before, they could not beat it out of their heads, but that he could have prevented the death of Lazarus, and could then raise him presently. Both which were right and rational conclusions, and did form a true religion in them.

But when Christ closed in with them upon it, and offered to make it good by raising the dead man presently, they all fell to recanting their faith: one cried, "He stinketh," and the other, "He hath been dead four days," and, thereupon, desired him to desist.

And the reason of the recantation is evident. The common religion then received amongst them concerning the resurrection was, (what we still retain), that "*there will be a resurrection at the last day.*"

And this having gained an impression upon them from the force of education, was too strong for that single impression which fell upon their minds from their own observation only. And, therefore, they thought it safer to renounce their own faith than the religion delivered them by their parents.

But Christ by doing the thing, did convince them that their own faith and opinion of him was right. And yet he did not say that the religion delivered them by their parents was wrong: for that there will be a resurrection at the last day, in which all they that are not before that time raised, shall then arise. But what he said (by this text) was, *that this resurrection at the last day doth not prevent a present resurrection from death, nor an immediate translation without death, to them whose faith is ready to receive it.*

WE MUST ALL BE CHANGED, BUT WE NEED NOT ALL DIE IN ORDER TO BE CHANGED; FOR 'TIS NOT DEATH THAT WORKS OUR CHANGE, BUT THE DEATH AND RESURRECTION OF CHRIST, WHICH WE MAY PASS THROUGH WITHOUT DEATH.

Paul was of this religion, that we may be changed without death: "We shall not all die, but we shall all be changed."

And yet 'tho he had delivered this to be his faith in general, he did not attain to such a particular knowledge of the way and manner of it, so as to prevent his own death. And his confession tells us the reason of his failure, *That he had not yet attained the resurrection of the dead, but was pressing after it.*

But 'tho he was taken away in this pursuit, he hath not lost his labor, but is got so much *nearer to the mark*, and at his resurrection will be so far before hand with them that never studied it.

He had but a late conversion, and, after that, was detained in the study of another part of Divinity, the confirming the New Testament by the Old, and making them answer one another ; in which he seems to have spent himself, and from whence all students in Divinity after him have stood upon his shoulders : for this is a point previous to the faith of translation, and must be learned before it in order to it

And this his pressing ('tho he did not attain) hath much encouraged me to make this inquiry ; being well assured that he would not have thus pursued it, had he not apprehended more in it than the vulgar opinion is about it.

We don't think ourselves fit to deal with one another in human affairs till our age of one-and-twenty. But to deal with our Maker thus offended, to counter-plot the malice of fallen angels, and to rescue ourselves from eternal ruin, we are generally as well qualified for before we can speak plain, as all our life-time after.

Children can say over their religion at four or five years old, and their parents that taught them can do no more at four or five-and-fifty. For religion being preached to them as a mystery, they are forbid to think of understanding it: *Græcum est, non potest legi.*

The common creed of the Christian religion may be learned in an hour. And one day's philosophy will teach a man to die.

But to know the virtue of the death and power of the resurrection of Christ, is a science calculated for the study of men and angels for ever.

But, if man may be thus changed without death, and that it is of no use to him in order to eternal life, what then is death ; or, whereunto serveth it ?

What is it ? Why 'tis a misfortune fallen upon man from the beginning ; and from which he hath not yet dared to attempt his recovery. And it serves as a *spectrum* to fright us into a little better life than (perhaps) we should lead without it.

"Tho God hath formed this covenant of eternal life against death, man still maintains a covenant with it: "They have made an agreement with death and hell." By way of composition, to submit to death, in hopes, by that obedience, to escape hell.

And under this oath of allegiance we think ourselves bound never to rebel against it.

The study of philosophy is, to teach men to die from the observations of nature.

The profession of divinity is, to enforce this doctrine from revelation.

And the science of the law is, to settle our civil affairs pursuant to these resolutions.

The old men are making their last wills and testaments: and the young are expecting the execution of them by the death of the testators.

And thus,

Mortis ad exemplum totus componitur orbis.

Now, what one man dares raise a faction against the whole world thus constituted under the political government of death?

Why but! if the truth of religion be defined by the number of professors, then the Mahometan is safer than the Christian, and the Romish than the Protestant.

The majority of votes in civil affairs may conclude our right, but it don't thereby convince our judgement. Nor are our rights thereby concluded further than for that turn only.

And thus it is in the whole scheme of government.

In the Power Elective: The majority of electors conclude the minority for that turn only.

In the Power Legislative: The majority of the Legislators make a law; but their successors are not by this precluded from repealing that law by another majority.

In the Power Judicial: The opinion of the majority make a rule in law; but their successors may alter those rules by the like majority. Which hath made much difference between opinions ancient and modern.

And 'tho these seem (and indeed are) incertainties in the law, yet the policy of man can't form a better : because those laws or judgments which are good at the time of the making, may come to be otherwise by things that may happen in revolution of time.

And, therefore, none but God himself (who alone foreknows times and seasons) can establish an eternal law.

When the vastness of empire in the Persian Monarchy had raised a pride in their kings to arrogate to themselves this power, it proved but a fallacy.

And thus when Hadassah (the Queen) had prevailed upon Alasuerus to reverse his decree for the massacre of the Jews, the Scribes (who were the lawyers in those days) soon found out an evasion of the law to suit the change of the King's mind. They let the former proclamation for the massacre go as it was; and issued out another, granting the Jews liberty to stand for their lives with force of arms.

And, thus, both these decrees were executed, with the loss of about 75,000 men slain on one side. And yet, forsooth, these two proclamations, so contrary to one another, and issued within less than three months one of the other, must bear the sacred name of eternal laws for the honor of the King that made them.

This I instance to show that the policy of man can't constitute an eternal law.

And from hence, (I say), I am not so much concerned for the present opinion of the world against me; because, being but the opinion of men, it is subject to a change. And I know the time when the whole world were of another opinion.

ADAM AND EVE HAD NO FEAR OF DEATH TILL THEY FELL UNDER THE LAW OF DEATH. AND COULD THEIR POSTERITY, WHO ARE FALLEN UNDER THIS LAW WITH THEM, APPREHEND THEIR DELIVERANCE FROM IT INTO THE LAW OF LIFE, THEY WOULD ALL BE CONVERTED IN A DAY.

I was under this law of death once ; and, while I lay under it, I felt the terror of it, till I had delivered myself from it by those thoughts that must convince them that have them. And in this thing only I wish (for their sakes) that all men were as I am.

Nor do I yet think myself obliged in this argument to dispute all

the rest of the world by unites. For in matters of faith men aggregate into churches and classes, where we may argue with a whole clan of them at once.

Now for children and madmen, and all the nations that know not God, nor call upon his name, I am no more capable of discussing this point with them, than with creatures wholly deprived of speech. But for the whole Christian world professing their religion from revelation, I'll venture to encounter them all at once, and that in their own creed—which I know they can run over as fast as a mariner doth the points of the compass.

But if after that we would but catechise ourselves a little in it, we shall find that, when we come to the main point, our faith will be, like the Athenian's worship, we believe, we know not what !

“ You believe in God, and in Jesus Christ his Son our Lord ; born of the Virgin ; suffered under Pontius Pilate ; crucified, dead, buried ; rose again the third day, ascended into Heaven, sitting at the right hand of God : and from thence he shall come to judge the living and the dead.”

Very well ! this is a full description of the person in whom you place your faith. But what is it that you do or would believe of him, or in him ?

Why, we believe him for our Saviour.

Save you ! from what ?

Why ! from our sins.

Why, what hurt will sin do you ?

Why, it will kill us.

How do you know ?

Why, the Law of God saith so : “ In the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt die.”

Why, but then will not this Saviour save you from this law, and from this death ?

No, no ; he'll save us from sin.

Why, then it seems you have got a pardon for horse-stealing, with a *non obstante* to be hanged.

Do but see now, what a jest you have made of your faith ! And yet, I defy the order of priesthood to form a better creed than this, without admitting the truth of my argument ; or, to make sense of their own faith, without adding mine to it.

It is much easier to make a creed, than to believe it after it is made. Nor can any man really believe any part of the Gospel that doth not believe it all. For it is a doctrine so dependant upon itself, that, unless we know the whole of it from the beginning to the end, we can't know the use or reason of any part of it.

Wherefore, (notwithstanding this inundation of death in the world, and the infection of fear contracted upon man from hence,) I am not afrighted from reassuming my assertion at the beginning:

That this long possession of death over man, is a possession against right.

That the length of this possession is no foreclosure of the right of man to life.

And that he that dares prosecute his claim with effect, may recover this right, and avoid that possession.

And that he that is got through the death and resurrection of Christ, hath had judgement against death, and execution of eternal life.

Christ by the instant of his resurrection, stood dissolved from all his former relations to the world; neither could he die any more, being become a child of the resurrection. For 'tho he did arise with the same body with which he died, yet that risen body was not the Son of the Virgin Mary, because he had assumed it by a new power, and in another manner than that by which he was first born.

The body with which he lay down in the grave was of no more use to him in his resurrection than so much other common matter; for he was put to add life to it by his own power—which he could have done to any other matter as well as that.

The present bodies of men laid down in the grave are of no use to God in the resurrection. Therefore, he permits them to be dissolved into any other forms, knowing that he can give the old forms again to any other matter by those characters of them which remain with him: "God is able out of these stones to raise up children unto Abraham."

And in this he resembles himself to a potter, who takes no care to preserve his broken pots for any other use of them; because, having the moulds by him, he can make several vessels of the same figure out of one earth as well as another. And 'tho all the vessels

of the same mould are not the same in identity of matter, yet being the same in form, they are the same to all uses, intents, and purposes.

And hence, 'tho the dead shall not arise with the same identity of matter with which they died, yet, being in the same form, they will not know themselves from themselves, being the same to all uses, intents, and purposes.

But in this God is so curious an artist that he keeps a several character in heaven for every figure of man on earth, by which (as the Apostle saith) "every seed shall receive its own body."

Whereas, we (like fac-simile mechanics) make one mould serve for a thousand figures.

But then as God (in the resurrection) is not bound up to use the same matter, neither is he obliged to use a different matter. Whenever the body to be raised doth remain so entire from corruption that the form of it is not spoiled, God uses that form again, as it is, without composing any other matter.

Thus he did with the body of Christ, according to that promise, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in grave, nor suffer thy Holy One to see corruption." And thus Christ did with the bodies he raised in the days of his flesh.

All which I instance still to show the insignificancy of death, one way or other, in order to eternal life; and that the death of man works no change in him.

To make this still more plain, consider when and where the predestination of God is executed upon man.

Christ said, "Rejoice in this, that your names are written in the Book of Life." Which he would not have commanded man upon earth, if the knowledge of it (which seems to be the top of man's ambition) were not attainable here.

Now this being part of the secret Will of God, (as his own memorandums of what he intends to do,) it can't be shown to man by inspection.

But when God comes to execute this secret will, then it becomes part of his revealed will, which belongs to man: "Secret things belong to God; but things revealed, to us and to our children."

AND THE TIME OF THE EXECUTION OF THIS DECREE BEING THE INSTANCE OF OUR FAITH IN CHRIST—"AS MANY AS WERE ORDAINED TO ETERNAL LIFE BELIEVED"—WE MAY BY THIS BE AS SURE THAT OUR NAMES ARE WRITTEN IN THE BOOK OF LIFE, AS IF WE HAD WROTE IT WITH OUR OWN HANDS. AND THAT THIS INSTANT OF FAITH IS THE TIME OF THE EXECUTION OF THIS DECREE, APPEARS BY WHAT CHRIST SAID TO THE THIEF ON THE CROSS: "THIS DAY SHALT THOU BE WITH ME IN PARADISE."

From whence some think themselves obliged to believe a separate existence of the soul from the body by death. For (say they) something of this man did immediately go into Paradise, and we see his body remains here : *ergo*, his soul went. Whereas, Christ did not speak this of the person, but the state of the man.

Christ and he were both under the same state before they were executed, which was the law of death. And that very day they both exchanged this state into the state of life; Christ by his own death, and the man by faith in him; 'tho the person of Christ went one way, and his another.

So, from the words of David, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in grave," there was a conception raised of the separate existence of of the soul; for (think we) the body of David is in the grave: *ergo*, his soul is gone to heaven by itself.

But Peter evinced this doctrine as erroneous, by showing that David spoke prophetically of the resurrection of Christ, in which the word soul comprehends his whole human life, which did die and rise together. And that it is translated *soul*, is an *Anglicism*, not understood in other languages, which have no other word for *soul* but the same which is for *life*. As 'tis usual for some peculiar countries to have an odd name for a common thing, which is not vulgarly known in any other parts of the same kingdom.

See how man's life came to him at first. God first formed the figure of man's body in common earth. (From whence men also form figures of one another.) Then to this figure God added life, by breathing it into him from himself, whereby this inanimate body became a living one. But in this composition the spirit is so perfectly mixed with and diffused through the whole body, that we can't now say which is *spirit*, nor which is *earth*; but the whole

is *one entire living creature*. As in leavened dough, we can't say which is the leaven, nor which is the dough.

But God, who first infused this life, can extract it out again, and leave the body as it was before this life was thus put into it. And this form of death God chose for man: "Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return."

God unmakes man just as he made him. He takes him to pieces like a jointed tool; he draws in his breath to himself, and leaves the lump to the elements of which it was at first composed, which by degrees loses its very form, and takes its place again in common with other matter.

And thus the spirit returns to God that gave it; for the remainder of the spirit is with him. But in this return, the spirit of man maintains no self-existence, having surrendered itself into the ocean of life, from whence it first flowed. When rivers return into the sea, they are no more rivers, but lose their name and property, being merged in the ocean of their original fountain.

And yet God doth retain in his memory the particular characters or ideas of every instance of life which he doth so extract, from whence (in the day of the restitution of all things) every body shall have its own spirit, and every spirit its own body.

But to return to my argument, (whence I have a little digressed, to descant upon this opinion of the self-existence of the soul).

If this man that was crucified with Christ, did immediately become in the same state with him, how comes it that he lies still in the grave, while Christ is ascended into the Heavens?

To this I say, that, 'tho this man's first faith did thus qualify him for a change of state, yet he had not proceeded far enough in this faith to qualify himself for an immediate translation of his person; but this he must expect with the rest of them who have died in the same faith with him, and who will not now attain that perfection till after the resurrection: *for there's no work in the grace.*

Man is as safe upon his first faith in Christ as if he were in Heaven; but he don't know it. And God will not deliver out eternal life to man faster than he makes him understand it; for the knowledge of eternal life is the essence of it: "*This is eternal life, to know God and Jesus Christ.*"

Every man possesses as much of eternal life as he knows ; and he knows as much as he possesseth, and no more. And what the residue of eternal life is, beyond our present knowledge, it hath not entered into the heart of man to conceive : for no man can know till he doth know.

And hence the different gifts of faith by God bestowed upon man are incommunicable to one another.

Abraham was singled out by God as the father of the faithful ; and yet he never attained the faith of translation, which his progenitor Enoch had done before him.

Elisha was an eye-witness of Elijah's translation, and had a double portion of his spirit given him, by which he wrought miracles on others ; and yet, after all, he died the common death of man, having not attained to the faith of his master in that point.

And thus the Apostles themselves, who raised others from the dead through faith in Christ, did not yet attain this faith to prevent themselves from death.

Whence, I say, that, God in the distribution of eternal life doth not give any part of it to man, contrary to his own opinion and apprehension of it.

And this is suitable to the dealings of men with one another. If an illiterate man be to seal a deed, which he can't read, and another takes upon him to read it to him, and reads it in other words than what are written, the law will adjudge the execution of it to be in the sense read, and not in the words written ; because he that sealed it did so understand it.

So, when the common preachers of the Christian religion do administer the blood of Christ to their communicants in the sacrament, as significant only to save them from hell after death, but as ineffectual against death itself, how should the people (who perhaps think themselves obliged to swear *in verba magistri*) have any higher conceptions of it.

And thus, " like priests, like people."

As it is delivered them, so they understand it.

And as they understand it, so they receive it.

And as they receive it, so it hath effect upon them : " According to thy faith be it unto thee."

Which faith (I say) is knowledge, not by sight, but by evidence of things not seen—of which we may have stronger notions than by our eye-sight.

The face of a man gives us but a superficial knowledge of him, but his works and writings tell us his principles and capacities.

And thus man knows God by his word and his works. Nor doth God offer himself to man in any way awkward to human understanding.

The reason why I believe that this doctrine I am asserting is true, is, because God hath said it. But yet I could not thus assert it by argument, if I did not conceive it with more self-conviction than I have from any maxims or positions in human science.

Whenever Christ speaks of life and resurrection, he means his own: "I am the resurrection and the life." And if we would thus understand him, this doctrine would be plain to us whether we would or no. But our heads are so full of our own business, that we can't think of any death or resurrection but that of our own persons.

And thus we are at cross purposes with him; as men are with one another, when one talks of *chalk* and another of *cheese*.

Christ saith, "they that attain that life, and the resurrection from the dead, can die no more, being the children of the resurrection."

Now here we fancy presently, that, when the persons of men have been once dead and risen again, they can die no more. But this is false; for Lazarus and the others raised by miracles did not thereby become the children of the resurrection, but remained still the children of this world, and as such died again.

But Christ by his resurrection did thereby become a child of the resurrection, and did not, nor could then after die any more.

And, therefore, whoever can attain this resurrection, can die no more neither. And this is attainable by knowledge acquired in study, like attainments in other sciences.

The perfection of any science is a mystery to the first beginners in it; and, hence, 'tis in vain to speak wisdom to any but the perfect.

Now the Covenant of Eternal Life is a law of itself, and a science of itself, which can never be known by the study of any other

science but itself. It is a science out of man's way, being a pure invention of God. Man knows no more how to save himself, than he did to create himself.

But to raise man's ambition to learn this, God graduates him upon his degrees of knowledge in it, and gives him badges of honor as belonging to that degree, as men do to one another in other sciences. And thus the knowledge of the virtue of the death and the power of the resurrection of Christ, makes a degree in this science. Upon the attainment whereof, a man gains the title of a child of the resurrection. To which title doth belong this badge of honor, to die no more, but to make our exit by way of translation, as Christ himself (who was the first of this order) did before us. And this world being the academy to educate man for Heaven: none shall ever enter there till they have taken this degree here. But when once they have passed this, they can never after be degraded again, to be turned down amongst the dead, (as the fallen angels were from Heaven), because they hold by the title of the Captain of their Salvation, which is absolute and indefeasible.

Take one thought more, which seems plainer than all the rest:

It is said, "We that are alive at his coming, shall be caught up together in the air with him;" and we are commanded to be always ready for the second coming of Christ.

Then, if death be necessary to qualify us for this second coming of Christ, the next thing we all have to do is to kill ourselves, that we may be so far in our way: unless we do expect that he should stay for us, when he comes, while we die and rise again—which he hath declared he will not do: "For the least stay for the greater." This long interval of time between his first and second coming, is allowed for the preaching of the gospel: "The gospel must first be preached through the whole world as a witness to all nations, and then shall the end be." But every man, as fast as he hears of it is in the meantime at liberty to embrace it, without staying for them that are to come after him.

The law and the prophets were until John; but since the days of John the Baptist, the kingdom of Heaven is preached, and every man passeth into it.

We are not confined to the religion of the old world, nor to expect the success of the latter days by the second coming of Christ, but are at liberty every moment to enter into the Kingdom of Heaven as fast as we can bring our faith up to it.

That he delays his second coming, is not that he hath any more to do in order to man's salvation, for as to that he declared it finished before ever he yielded to death. But the world is not ready to receive him, and till then the Heavens must contain him. Whence this is called the day of his patience.

But this doth not prohibit them that are ready to come to him where he is: "Come, for all things are now ready." He then was, and still is ready for the resurrection of the dead: "The hour is coming, and now is, when the dead shall hear the voice of the Son of God; and they that hear shall live." Where we see the emphasis of the resurrection is not placed in any point of time, but in the hearing of that voice, be it when it will.

And 'tis observable that in all the miracles wrought by him upon the bodies of the dead, he used different words of command, according to the different circumstances which the persons to be raised were then under.

The son of the widow of Nain, and the daughter of Jairus, being both dead, and neither buried, when he first came to them, he only said to them "Arise;" but Lazarus being in the grave, he said to him, "Come forth."

And he did not only give different words of command, but prefixed to each command a particular description of the very person he called for. He touched the bier of the widow's son and said, "Young man, arise." And took the Ruler's daughter by the hand and said, "Maid, arise." And Lazarus he called by his name. Which were injunctions to the rest of the dead to lie still till he called them. For as he himself observed in two other instances, "That there were many widows in the days of the famine; but unto none of them was the prophet sent, save unto the woman of Sarepta: and many lepers in the days of Elisha the Prophet, but none of them were cleansed save Naaman the Syrian." So, many young men and maids were dead and buried in those days of the Son of Man, but none of them were raised save those he called for.

Nor did they arise together, nor any one of them by virtue of the word of command given to the other of them, but every one in his own order, as they were named and called. Nor shall there a man or woman arise from the dead for ever till the Son of God calls them by their name. And whoever, after that, dares stay for his fellows, shall never be called again.

They that were first bidden to the feast and refused to come, were not again admitted with them that accepted the invitation, but stand barred forever by that dreadful sentence, "They shall never taste of my supper." And yet they did not refuse it by a flat denial, but with the usual complement that "they were otherways engaged."

But if he would not admit the son of a dead man to go back and bury his father, dare we ask him leave (after he had called us to Eternal Life) to go and lie with our dead fathers and our dead mothers till the resurrection at the last day? Let the dead bury the dead, and the dead lie with the dead, and the rest of the living go lie with them: I'll follow him that was dead, and is alive, and lives forever.

Nor can I think who I should stay for. Will any one pursuing after wealth, wait for a beggar? Or he that's flying for his life, keep pace with a cripple? Why then should a man, aspiring after Heaven, stay for petty canons and vestry-men?

I remember the best bred man that ever was in the world, commended publicans and harlots for entering into the Kingdom of God before them that thought themselves their betters. And, therefore, he that stands complementing with the door of eternal life in his hand, offering the ceremony to others to go before him, shews himself no courtier of Heaven.

And 'tho now I am single, yet I believe that this translation of faith without death will be general, before the general change Paul speaks of shall come. And that then, and not before, shall be the resurrection of the just, which is called the first resurrection. And after that the dead so arisen, with the living then alive, shall have learnt this faith, which shall qualify them to be caught up together in the air, then shall the general resurrection of the dead be. After which time shall be no more.

But I expect that the beginning of this faith (like all other parts of the Kingdom of Heaven) will be like a grain of mustard-seed, spreading itself by degrees, till it overshadow the whole earth.

And since the things concerning him must have an end, in order to that, they must have a beginning.

But whoever leads the van, will make the world start; and must expect for himself, to walk up and down like Cain with a mark in his forehead, and run the gauntlet for an Ishmælite, having every man's hand against him, because his hand is against every man. Than which nothing is more averse to my temper.

And this makes me think of publishing, with as much regret as he that ran away from his errand when sent to Niniveh. But being just going to cross the water, I dare not leave this behind me undone, lest a tempest send me back again to do it. And to shelter myself a little, ('tho I know my speech would betray me) I left the title page anonymous. Nor do I think that anything would now extort my name from me, but the dread of the sentence: "He that is ashamed of me, and of my words, before men, of him will I be ashamed before my Father and his angels." For fear of which, I dare not but subscribe my argument, tho' with a trembling hand—having felt two powers within me all the while I have been about it: one bids me write, and the other bobs my elbow.

But since I have wrote this, as Pilate did his inscription, without consulting any one thing else about it, I'll be as absolute in mine as he was in his: "What I have written, I have written." And after this I'll never write again, but spend the residue of my days in action—contrary to the regular profession of religion.

And, having pursued that command, "Seek first the Kingdom of God," I yet expect the performance of that promise, "To receive in this life an hundred-fold, and in the world to come life everlasting."

I have a great deal of business yet in this world, without doing of which Heaven itself would be uneasy to me. And, therefore, do depend that I shall not be taken hence in the midst of my days before I have done all my heart's desire.

But when that is done, I know no business I have with the dead, and, therefore, do as much depend that I shall not go hence by returning to the dust—which is the sentence of that law from which I

claim a discharge—but that I shall make my exit by way of translation; which I claim as a dignity belonging to that degree in the science of eternal life of which I profess myself a graduate, according to the true intent and meaning of the Covenant of Eternal Life revealed in the Scriptures.

And if, after this, I die like other men, I declare myself to die of no religion.

And in this, let no one be concerned for me as a desperade. For I am not going to renounce the other parts of our religion, but to add another article of faith to it, without which I can't understand the rest.

And if I lose this additional article, by failing in this attempt, I have as much religion left still as they that pity me.

Nor have I in all this spoken presumptuously, or from fancy; having said nothing but what he that made me said before me. And if it be possible to believe too much in God, I desire to be guilty of that sin.

I dread no hell but the sentence prepared against them that despise the gospel: "Behold! ye despisers, and wonder and perish." Behold what? Behold, "Men coming from the east, and from the west, to sit down in the kingdom of God, and you yourselves shut out." Shut out from what? To be shut out from virtue and holiness, justice and truth, perhaps would be no uneasiness to us all; but to be shut out from an eternal draught of an eternal stream of love, from the marriage feast of the King's Son, from the view of his bride adorned in her glory, and from all the joys of nuptials for ever, this will be a torment, created by man to himself through unbelief, beyond the exquision of tyrants, or the exquision of devils.

It seems conceivable that man by his change into the other world, will not lose any species of his present affections, or have any new ones added to them; but that all those passions which are now begun in him, will there increase upon him forever: "He that is holy, let him be holy still; and he that is filthy, let him be filthy still."

And then, 'tho man cannot now conceive by what objects his passions or affections will be thus argued, yet, by his present

feeling of them, he may conceive the nature, 'tho not the perfection, of his future joys or torments.

Did you ever feel a fit of envy? Multiply that by thousands till you want a name of number, and then call that the thousandth thousandth part of one of the torments of hell!

Did you ever feel a pang of love? Spend your days in Algebra, and carry on the account of it to Heaven, and there add to that for ever, till your desire fail, and you'll never begin to sum the total!

All life is motion, and therefore cannot be eternal without an eternal motion. For whenever it comes to stagnate, the patient rots, and stinks and dies.

The most pleasant enjoyments being kept long in our hands pall our appetites to them. And, hence, the smallest addition to what we had before, seems greater riches to us than all our former possessions. And every new thought that falls into our studies, proves a greater diversion to us than all our former knowledge.

Now in all inventions of men towards perpetuity of motion, they never attempt anything beyond a circle, which moving itself by rotation comes to the same place again.

But the motion calculated for the maintenance of eternal life, is made to move in a direct ascent for ever; in every reach of which we see, and taste, and feel what we never did before: "The water that I shall give him, shall be a spring of living water, rising up to everlasting life."

But behold, ye despisers, and wonder! Wonder at what? Wonder, to see Paradise lost, with the Tree of Life in the midst of it. Wonder, and curse at Adam for an original fact, who, in the length of one day, never so much as thought to put forth his hand, for him and us, and pull, and eat, and live for ever. Wonder at and damn ourselves for fools of the last impression, that in the space of seventeen hundred years never so much as thought to put forth our hands, every one for himself, and seal and execute the Covenant of Eternal Life, and live for ever!

But behold, ye despisers, and wonder, and perish! Perish, how? Why perish under the same malice against the Son of God for ever: "They blasphemed God, and yet repented not to give him glory;" being

concluded under unbelief, from the day of adjournment of time into eternity, proclaimed by the last of the seven heralds of angels, who, "setting his right foot upon the sea, and his left foot upon the earth, lifted up his hand to heaven, and swore by Him that lives for ever, that time should be no longer."

And now bear with me a little, while I prepare myself for being shown as a monster.

'Tis no news for believers and unbelievers to be the admiration of one another. They wondered at his works, and he marvelled at their unbelief: "And this is a marvellous thing, that ye know not whence he is, who hath opened the eyes of one born blind." Therefore, to be even with the world at once, he that wonders at my faith, I wonder at his unbelief. And stare at me as long as you will, I am sure that neither my physiognomy, sins, nor misfortunes, can make me look so unlikely to be translated as my Redeemer was to be hanged. And 'tho, perhaps, I may be the sport of some, yet I can't but think and say again, that, whoever is designed for happiness will meet with some of that pleasure in reading which I have had in writing; and whoever are not so appointed, no one can lament them more than I do. Nor can I think how any man that is right in his religion, can be wrong in his morals, which are all set to right in him, as an incident to his faith.

The blood of Christ hath an incident quality, which cleanseth from sin. But this quality is subsequent and accidental to that legal sanction, and first appointment of it, to take away the law of death. And he that understands this aright, never makes any use of his own personal virtues as an argument for his own salvation; lest God should overbalance against him with his sins. Nor doth God ever object a man's own personal sins to him in the day of his faith; because Christ had no credit given him for his personal holiness in the day of his death. And, therefore, till I am more sinful than he was holy, my sins are no objection against my faith. And because in him is all my hope, I care not almost what I am myself,

This I know from abroad, that, Wisdom is better than folly :

Earnest, than jest:

Love, than hatred:

Riches, than poverty:

Health, than sickness:

A virtuous woman, than a whore:

And; an honest man, than a knave.

And when now and then I cast my eyes within me, I thank God I find cruelty, covetousness and envy departed from me. I can't envy a man of merit, because "the laborer is worthy of his hire." And as long as I maintain a perfect friendship with myself, I can be no more a rival to another placed above his desert, than a beautiful female is to one of her own sex, harder favored and finer dressed. And as I thus envy no man, I can't think myself big enough for any one to envy me. But if they do, I keep an answer within my conscience to all the hatred and malice of man against me: "They hate me without a cause." Besides this, I say no more to any one concerning religion or morality either. And if any one hath ought of either to say to me, whenever they shall please to make that as public as I have done this, I'll read it. But what they shall not think worth their writing, I shall not think worth my hearing.

It is observed in the mathematics, that the practice doth not always answer the theory. And that, therefore, there is no dependence upon the mere notions of it, as they lie in the brain, without putting them together in the form of a tool or instrument, to see how all things fit. Upon which, whole sets of thoughts have been lost, and the student set at large again. And this made me distrust my own thoughts till I had put them together to see how they would look in the form of an argument. But in doing of this I thank God I have found every joint and article to come into its own place, and fall in with, and suit one another to a hair's breadth beyond my expectation. Or else I could not have had the confidence to produce this as an engine in divinity, to convey man from earth to Heaven. And, to give every one their due, this advantage I have had by Enoch and Elijah: that 'tho neither of them have left the form of their faith behind them, yet their doing the thing before me heartened me on to study out the invention myself. And as I

never did, nor will, desire any man to confine himself to my understanding; so, in making this inquiry, I have set no bounds to my thoughts, but the very word of revelation, without regarding the opinion of other men about it. Not but that there are flights in other sciences that seem as extravagant to vulgar apprehensions as this doth, and yet they are evincible by demonstration.

Every bungler can do business with bustling and main strength, but the perfection of science is to do the hardest things with the least labor.

A mathematician, by a right position of his power at a due distance from the center, will move a weight by the force of one hand, which five hundred men heaving at it all together close upon the center can't stir. And according to this art, it cannot be denied that the whole weight of this terrestrial globe is moveable by the strength of a hair, and the force of a man's breath, only by getting far enough off from the center before he gives the puff. And 'tho this can't be done by man for want of a place thus to stand in, yet the demonstration of it to our understanding, causes us to adore the wisdom and happiness of the Architect of Nature and Ruler of the World, who sitting upon the heavens, can rein the earth with a twined thread. And this prompts us to believe that God can do other impossible things, and teach man to do them too: "He that believeth on me shall do greater works than these." Not by his own labor, but by putting the labor-oar upon God.

Men may dig and carry till their hearts ache to remove a mountain: but the engine of faith draws down the power of God, which removes it all at once.

I am not making myself wings to fly to Heaven with, but only making myself ready for that conveyance which shall be sent me. In which I don't pretend any privilege above other men that are or will be ready with me; which it seems they say themselves they are not, nor shall be, till the resurrection at the last day. But remember that Samuel came up in his old mantle, which makes me think you'll return much as you went.

However, let us part friends, and every one make the best of his way. And if I should lose myself in this untrodden path of life, I can still find out the beaten road of death blindfold. And as I

would not allure any man, woman or child, to venture themselves with me till they see my success: so their company would do me no good, for every one must attain it by their own faith. And if this faith will do, I have it; and if it will not do in me, it will not do in them—for God is no respecter of persons. And yet had I a mind to juggle, I would not put the decision upon so blunt a point. I can write, and talk too, as soft as other men: *With submission to better judgements. And, I leave it to you, gentlemen. I am but one, and I always distrust myself. I only hint my thoughts. You'll please to consider whether you will not think that it may seem to deserve your consideration.*

This is a taking way of speaking, but much good may do them that use it. I don't desire to take it from them; 'tho 'tis the safest way, because there can be no advantage taken of it to do themselves any hurt—nor any one else any good. But as I have more respect for myself than to trouble the world with common discourses, so I have more reverence for mankind than to hazard the meanest figure of it with any novelty but what I will first pawn my life to try the truth or falsehood of it. And 'tho I do own that the very daring of this essay is too great an honor for me to be guilty of, yet I know there is that gratitude left in man, that since I am willing to take the shame of my own mistake, they will not begrudge me the result of my success. If, therefore, as I have said before, after this, I go the way of my fathers, I freely wave that haughty epitath:

“Magnis tamen excidit Ausis.”

And, instead of that, knock under table that Satan hath beguiled me to play the fool with myself; in which, however, he hath shewed his master-piece; for I defy the whole clan of Hell to form another lie so like to truth as this is.

But if I act my motto, and go the way of an eagle in the air, then I have played a trump upon death, and shewn myself a match for the devil.

And while I am thus fighting with death and hell, it looks a little like foul play for flesh and blood to interpose themselves against me.

But, if any one hath spite enough to give me a polt, thinking to falsify my faith, by taking away my life, I only desire them first to qualify themselves for my executioners by taking this short test in their own consciences:

Whoever thinks that any thing herein contained is not fair dealing with God and man, and giving the devil himself his due, let him, or her, burn this book, and cast a stone at him that wrote it.

J. ASGILL.



NOTES.

NOTES.

PAGE 59.—“*If it be His that I think it is, it will kindle*” etc.

The spirit of this martyred author may, as we think, have viewed his words, written here, as fulfilled, when, in the eternal world, he became aware that in “the fulness of time,” (1866), the doctrine that he taught took fire again, and was in that year, in the *Empire City*, (New York),—and that because it was rejected by the Archbishop of Dublin, especially, and, generally, by all the prelates of the Irish Church at home,—brought out as a truth, on totally independent grounds, by one who had never heard of JOHN ASGILL or his views. In fact, the present editor first heard of ASGILL in the month of July, 1872—above six years after he had done his work of testimony in America: and there, because he was rejected and refused a hearing in Ireland. He might add, in England, too. Although the Estimable Primate the Most Reverend Doctor LONGLEY, Archbishop of Canterbury, was not compromised by the refusal. Had it depended on him, I should have been heard. He, himself, told me that he had applied by letter to Doctor CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, one of the Canons of Westminster, now Bishop of Lincoln, to hear me; but Dr. W. pleaded other duties, and so declined. I had, previously, written myself to Canon WORDSWORTH to intreat a hearing, but in vain. So did I do in the case of Cannon MELVILL, with whom I had several interviews, but without effect. I, also, sought to be heard at length by the present Dean STANLEY, whom I saw on the subject: but likewise in vain at Westminster Abbey, at the Deanery, in the Cloisters. However, I acquit the English Clergy—I was “*only Irish*.” it was not their bounden duty to attend to me. And, branded as I was by *the guilt of having smitten popery*—then in the ascendant—in the person of Father MAGUIRE, they were almost excusable in fearing

identification with such a person. And, so, the guilt rests upon the Irish Church—prelacy and clergy. Now, in reality, it was the inspiration of that Church, as will be seen in the memoir, which expelled ASGILL from Parliament. I am now, and was then, perfectly certain that if the Archbishop of Dublin had given me a hearing, he might have said to Mr. GLADSTONE, when he threatened the Irish Church with dis-establishment, "Take heed what you do! You do not know what the Church is, or what its latent power. We have now the most distinguished Clergyman of our body under examination, and have reason to think that the Church is within reach of supernatural powers that will enable it to perpetuate life, raise the dead and heal the sick. In short, do all the works of Christ; and greater works than those which on earth he was pleased to do. Therefore, in dissociating such a body from the State, you will take action against the best interests of the people." Now had the Archbishop, as a Peer of the Realm, spoken thus, GLADSTONE must have paid attention to him, and would, I doubt not, have done so; and, we may be sure he would thus have been estopped in his very questionable proceedings. But it was not to be. The Irish Church led to ASGILL's expulsion from Parliament: and the Irish Prelates must be visited for the transgression—in getting themselves expelled from the House of Lords—for rejecting the messenger who had been Divinely raised to bring before them the very principle which—although the fact was then utterly unknown to him—JOHN ASGILL had, nearly two hundred years before, announced; and had been expelled from Parliament for announcing.

All must be abased before the Throne of God at such a view of the marvels accomplished by an over-ruling Providence, and exclaim, in a feeling of adoration, "What hath God wrought: to Him alone be the glory!"

PAGE 60.—"*Why, then, if I have as good a faith for this purpose as he had,*" etc.

Yes; but, by your leave, good Mr. ASGILL, the "faith" of Enoch, of which St. Paul wrote, led Enoch to that "walk with God" of which Moses wrote. And both the "faith" and the "walk" were

necessary to the translation. Enoch walked with God: that is, they both walked together. Now, how can two walk together except they be agreed? God walked with Enoch exceptionally; but, God was not to walk with the redeemed children of men regularly, until "the Kingdom of God" should come. And, since it was not the fulness of the time for its coming when ASGILL wrote, therefore, that remarkable man was before the time by little less than two hundred years—exactly, from the date of his book, *one hundred and sixty-six* years—and, so, he did not himself attain that to which he so anxiously looked forward. However, in the downfall of the Irish Establishment he has been avenged. While the smallest benefice in that Church—from which his message emanated—has been exempted from the degradation and loss of either dis-endowment or dis-establishment.

PAGE 62.—"*Ante obitum*," etc.

[Call no man happy while he breathes the breath
Of life—wait till he pass the gates of death.]

"*Now, the assertion*" etc.

While the Parliament in Dublin, made short work with Mr ASGILL—condemning with a unanimous vote his book as blasphemous and subversive of society—the Parliament in Westminster, had some divisions as to the condemnation of the author and his book, and specified eleven passages which were particularly chargeable with the offence of blasphemy: which was, however, imputed to the whole work. Of these passages the first was the above clause, saying that the magnetic influence of the Gospel in drawing followers was what ASGILL called the promise of perpetual, or eternal life. He replied to the charge by asking them to read the two next paragraphs, in which our Saviour's own disciples, when asked whether they also would leave him, replied, by saying, that his promise of eternal life made this impossible: "Lord, to whom should we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life."

PAGE 62.—"*Then was he an impostor*," etc.

This was the second Passage that Parliament condemned; alleging that our author called Christ *an impostor*! His answer, of course,

was, that, so far from thus injuriously speaking of him, his language was actually intended to show that it was impossible to view him as such.

PAGE 63.—*“Custom itself, without a reason for it, is an argument only to fools,” etc.*

This is, unquestionably, a sound position. But it might have been exploded by saying that the custom of death had in it a valid reason. The death of the Apostles, who, had it been possible, would have escaped death, but, since it was not possible, died, shows that the custom of death was reasonable. And, it might have been added, was then inevitable too: for it was “appointed unto men once to die.” Now, however, we plead that this is no longer so. Why? Because, according to Paul’s own words, it was a prophesy “*in part*,” and it was to be done away when that which should be “perfect had come.” (*See 1 Cor. 13:10*). Now the Message of Life, which I offer, is that which is perfect. How so? Because, (1). It was brought out at 1866, which was the fullness of the time. (2). Within 1866, the Message was completed, and sealed with a valid testimony—on the 30th Dec., 1866, one day within the limit. (3). It was brought out by a legitimate messenger, a duly authorized minister of the Church of Ireland, and in conformity with all the laws, ecclesiastical and civil, of a christian State: and, then, in the presence of monarch-men—for every American citizen is an heir presumptive to the throne of the government of the country. Now, it was the death of Christ after his preaching and after his establishment of the Church, and it was the subsequent preaching of that Church, during an epoch that counted 1866 years, and it was the action of a minister out of the Irish Church, (one of the most ancient in Christendom), that led to this, and took the needful action on it. And what was the result? Why the result was, that that minister with his parochial charge was providentially made an exception to the degradation and the injury which, in about the period of three or four years afterwards, fell upon the whole Irish Church besides. The numerous circumstances which show that a special Providence wrought for this message are most remarkable, and shall be noticed at the proper place.

PAGE 66.—“*And that yet he omitted this too,*” etc.

Now, I venture to submit, that, this does not follow. It is highly probable that he did take of the tree of life and did eat of its fruit. And why? Because it was not forbidden. Nay, it is possible that it may have been commanded: that he may have been told that in the fruit of that tree there was a virtue that would sustain life, and that in order to preserve life, that fruit should be made use of continually, and that if he ceased to use it he would die. And if we consider the words of Genesis 3:22-3, we shall find that they sustain this view. The words are, “*And the Lord God said, ‘Behold, the man is become as one of us, to know good and evil:’ and now, lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever: therefore, the Lord God sent him forth from the garden of Eden, to till the ground from whence he was taken.*” Now, I submit, that the words may have this sense, and that without the slightest wresting of their sense, viz.: “*And now, also, lest he should stretch out his hand and by taking of the tree of life, and eating, live forever: therefore he drove him from the garden.*” I repeat the words may have this force; nay, they might possibly be so pointed as that this should be their actual grammatical force. For the Hebrew for “take” and for “eat,” might be so pointed as to be the simple participles of their respective verbs, and if so, the above would be the legitimate rendering of the verse. The verb in every language has this kind of frequentative sense. Thus, when we say, “Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved,” the meaning is, have faith in Christ and constantly exercise it, and thou shalt be saved. The sacred writer does not mean to say, “exercise faith in the Lord Jesus Christ even once and thou shalt live: for having once exercised that faith thou shalt have passed from death unto life, and shalt live forever.” That surely is not the meaning, but the true meaning is, “Believe in the Lord Jesus Christ, and continue to exercise that faith henceforward, and thou shalt be saved.” And it would appear to me that in such a sense the words in Genesis 3:22, should be taken. The 16th verse of the preceding chapter (*the Second*) deserves consideration: it runs thus in the original, “*And the Lord God commanded upon the man, (that is, as it were, put his commandment upon him), saying,*

‘From every tree in the garden eating thou shalt eat, but of the tree of knowledge of good and evil thou shalt not eat of it; for in the day thou eatest of it dying thou shalt die.’ (That is, “*thou shalt surely die.*”)

Now, since one tree alone was excepted, and since the tree of life was of special excellence, the probability is that that was specially partaken of while he had the chance and opportunity—that opportunity was taken from him when he was turned out of the garden, and the Cherubims, with the flaming sword which turned away, were posted to keep the way of the tree of life. I may take the occasion to remark that it is essentially the same Hebrew word, which is an acknowledged and undeniable participle (or verbal adjective) in the last cited verse, (Genesis 2: 16), which is employed in chapter 3: 22. The indubitable principle which recognizes in the tree of life the antetype of Him who was the *True Vine*, and whose flesh and blood are the meat and drink of his people, conferring immortality, may convince us that it was the constant use of the tree of life, and not a single participation of its fruit, (as our author supposes), that would lead to the eternal life spoken of in Genesis 3: 22.

PAGE 72.—“*They were all against him, because God was against him,*” etc.

The clause ending thus constituted the third passage condemned as blasphemous by the English House of Commons. One is astonished at reading the plain truths which were condemned as outrageous blasphemy, by a Chamber of Senators zealous for God—but not according to knowledge. Our author, in his reply, boldly repeated the objectionable statement. Saying, that, God was indeed against him: and was so determined and resolved on the eternal sacrifice of his own son, that all the powers in heaven and earth could not effectually oppose it. The additional objections made to our author’s words were equally void of validity. But, as we have sufficiently set them forth elsewhere, we need not make them the subject of observation in these Notes.

PAGE 89.—“*Why because, man knows not the way of life,*” etc.

This answer would be perfectly valid at the present day, if it

were applied to explain the death of men generally now; because the way of life has been announced, and the law of life ascertained sufficiently. But the answer was certainly insufficient in Mr. ASGILL'S day. He evidently labored under the idea that because the death of Christ had paid the price of a complete recovery from all the consequences of the fall, therefore, it was because of want of light to see this, and want of courage to plead it and act upon it, men continued to die. Had this been so, ASGILL would be alive himself this day. For his whole life and this book are sufficient to prove that he neither lacked light nor courage. His answer was therefore invalid. The Bible does indeed prove that Christ paid the price of a full atonement for the fall, but subject to a condition that it should not be available for the full possession of the kingdom until a time discoverable from the Bible: which time "the Father had put in his own power," (*Acts, 1:7*); a day and an hour known neither to angels nor archangels, nor to the Son, but to the Father only. (*Mark, 13:32*). And yet, it was hidden in the scriptures throughout; but so hidden there, so bound up with an unobserved numerical power in the letters of the consecrated tongues, without respect to which the sacred penmen wrote, that in their utterances they unwittingly gave the dates of times, and the numbers of names of which they themselves knew nothing. The providence of God was, nevertheless, so overruling events as to make them all the time re-echo and bring out the oracles of God. How little did JOHN ASGILL know that his own name clearly foreshowed him as a forerunner of the true "Bride, the Lamb's wife," (*see Rev. 19:7*), who should, in due time, make herself ready for scriptural coöperation with her Lord and Master Christ.—(*See Psalm 45:10, in the Hebrew*). His reasoning here then is important as applicable to a fuller message than his was.

PAGE 93.—"*The text runs double,*" etc.

With all respect to our author, he both garbles this text and misunderstands it. The exact words of our Lord are: "*I am the resurrection, and the life: he that believeth in me, though he have died, shall live: and whosoever liveth, and believeth in me, shall never die,*"

(more exactly, "*Shall not die at the age,*" i.e., at "*that age.*"—See *Luke, 20:35; John, 11:25, 26*). The duplex statement of the text is, (1) Those who have died believing in a coming Christ, (as Abraham and the Patriarchs, David and the Prophets), shall rise from the dead, and live again. (2) Whosoever liveth, when I am fully revealed, as the Saviour of the body, in the fulness of the times, and shall then walk with God, according to the law of life to be then disclosed, shall never die. I venture to submit that our Lord's words included a latent explanation, such as is here given—that the whole scripture contemplated a fuller announcement of the Divine will at the day of judgement, and the fulfilment of conditions for the obtainment of literal immortality, that were not essential or necessary under the gospel of free grace and mere promise. I may add here, that the original Greek in the phrase "*that age,*" which in the authorized version is rendered "*never,*" included the very date of the age—the 60th decade of the 19th century—1861!

PAGE 96.—"*What then is death; or whereunto serveth it?*" etc.

I think I may pronounce our author's explanation here very incomplete; and declare more fully what is but little if at all known, that death is the *true purgatory* of the sinful and fallen body, and the real substance of the pagan *ideal* of purgatory that the *Pontifex Maximus* of Rome has succeeded in preserving, and very gainfully utilizing, as a Christian Institution. The body leaves all vileness in the grave, and will thence issue, upon due action to be taken by the Church, purged and purified as a glorious and immortal being. That has been the object of death, and the service it had rendered heretofore; but, hereafter, the discovery of that law of walking with God, which preceded translation in the case of Enoch, and, I doubt not, in the case of Elijah too, having been exceptionally made known to them both, will be an essential character of the new dispensation, and it will accomplish that change in the living body, and lead to translation; which has, heretofore, been only to be reached through the dissolution of the dead body in the grave. And, perhaps, this is the proper place to offer the remark that the disposal of the dead by *Cremation*

is most certainly not merely opposed to all Scriptural warrant, but is such an obvious conformity to pagan custom, as may be connected with very serious spiritual danger. If we are to be guided in all religious action by the example and precepts of the bible, we shall seek in vain in its pages for a warrant for the burning of the dead. Paul speaks of the buried bodies of the faithful as seed sown; and since we should look in vain for crops of wheat, or barley, or rye, or any other grain, if we burned the seed, instead of burying it in the soil, the analogy should lead us to think that cremation would be no very hopeful way of disposing of our dead.

PAGE 103.—“*Dust thou art, and unto dust shalt thou return.*” etc.

In promulgating my views as to the certainty of translation instead of death, there is no text that seems so plenary as an objection, as this, taken from Genesis 3:19. The answer, however, is obvious: it is, as the children of the First Adam, we are dust. And so long as we are nourished on grass—either vegetarian or fleshy—so long the sentence will stand in force against us that to dust we must return. But if we be born again from the Second Adam, who is not dust, and if our bodies are so acted upon, by a law of life that keeps us constantly occupied with a Sacrificial Worship, in which we walk with God, and take in of the spiritual flesh and blood of Jesus as our food and drink, we shall gradually become transformed to his glorious messianic nature, and cease to be dust; and thus not having come from dust, we shall have no reason, nor indeed any possibility of returning to it. As our true father will be the Lord from heaven, and as we shall be transformed into his nature, we may go direct to heaven; or rather heaven will come to us—for the heaven of believers is a regenerated “world to come,” vastly different from the present. It would be in contravention of reason itself that when our bodies had by a second birth from a Second Adam, who was not dust, and though a process of gradual translation into his nature, which was calculated to lead to the gradual deposition of every particle of the dust that we derived from our first birth, we should then, after all, be resolved into the dust of the lower nature which we had actually put off altogether.

MINISTERIAL TESTIMONY.

THE LATTER DAY REVELATION OF THE LORD JESUS CHRIST,
DELIVERED IN 1866.



AN INSTRUMENT OF MINISTERIAL TESTIMONY, COMPLETED IN THE PRESENCE OF THREE CONGREGATIONS, CONVENED TO AND ASSEMBLED FOR DIVINE WORSHIP IN ARGUS HALL, 600 BROADWAY, NEW YORK, ON DECEMBER 30th, 1866, BY THE REV. DR. TRESHAM D. GREGG, CHAPLAIN OF ST. NICHOLAS WITHIN, DUBLIN, IRELAND.

I, Tresham Dames Gregg, Doctor in Sacred Theology, Presbyter of the Church of Ireland, and Chaplain of St. Nicholas Within, Dublin, thus a benefice Clergyman of the United Church of England and Ireland, in due and full connection with the Church, to all persons, both present and future, do hereby testify and declare that, having for above a quarter of a century devoted myself to the constant study of the original Scriptures, I was led to ascertain and demonstrate the soundness of certain great points of theology not previously, that I am aware of, brought before the Church. Two of these, in especial, I made the grounds of solemn petition to the Convocation of Canterbury in England, and to the two houses of Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church of America—those two points alluded to, being—

1st. That the host of the mass in the Church of Rome was the ultimate “Abomination of Desolation,” spoken of by Daniel the Prophet; and,

2dly. That the worship of the Christian Church should be expressly sacrificial.

My prayer to the Synods of the Churches of America and of the United Church of England and Ireland being that they should examine into the reasoning on which these positions rested, and act accordingly. But as the petitions thus alluded to are in print, and very fully expressive of the views set forth, I do not think myself called on here to say more on the subject than to express a hope that they may be carefully read and pondered on.

Having visited the United States in 1861, and sojourned here till 1862, I was then led to think it my duty to publish a version of the English and American Book of Common Prayer, that was entitled, "*Ad Interim—the Order for Morning and Evening Sacrifice throughout the Year submitted to the Church.*" This book was published in New York and Philadelphia. I presented copies of it to several of the American bishops, and fifty copies to the two houses of Convention. To this publication I referred in my petitions to the Convention, and mentioned the fact of my presentation of these copies in my petitions. The presentation of the petitions was undertaken for by the Rev. Dr. De Wolfe Howe, of Philadelphia, a clergyman of the highest character; and I conclude, therefore, that they were presented, although he has not expressly informed me that they were. During my former visit to this country I took no further action in reference to this matter.

But in the present year, 1866, divers causes, which I esteemed as most providential in their character, moving me thereunto, I embarked for the United States at Liverpool on February the 21st, and arrived in New York on the 7th of March, and, having announced my intention in the public papers and otherwise, I solemnized the Morning Sacrifice, with choral accompaniments as full as I could command, on Easter Sunday morning in Clinton Hall, Astor place, assisted by a large congregation, and using as my ordinal the aforementioned book.

Subsequently I saw my way to no congregational action in this direction, though anxiously seeking for it, until Michaelmas, on which day (the 29th September) I announced in the public papers that I had taken Argus Hall, No. 600 Broadway, for the last Sunday in September and for the whole month of October for Sunday services. I was enabled to do likewise for the months of November and December; and, therefore, during the Sundays of these last three

months of this year—viz., the last in September, and during October, November, and December of 1866—I have on every such Lord's Day solemnized divine services sacrificially morning and evening, and occasionally also in the afternoon, before congregations as numerous as, under the circumstances, I could expect, preaching on the occasion of each service in exposition and enforcement of Gospel verity in general, but especially of the more novel points brought forward in my petitions to the Churches both of America and of the United Church of England and Ireland.

That in those petitions I stated that the principles which I had opened from the book of Daniel and other scriptures were clavicular in their character and sure to open the way to dark mysteries of the Christian religion that had been “shut up and sealed to the time of the end;” and that my experience since the drawing-up of my petitions—viz., four years since—most remarkably confirmed during those three months' congregational services (or, more properly, presentations of the sacrifice) in Argus Hall, has forcibly verified this statement; and, I now feel myself called upon by solemn duty to God, to the Church, and to the world at large, to set forth in an articular manner the chief conclusions of this nature at which I have arrived, and which I suppose myself, and have been acknowledged by others to have demonstrated in the course of my sermons, and that to the satisfaction of my hearers.

1. That there is latent in the true sacrifice of the Church, as I have explained and used it, a virtue which, if habitually and constantly employed, will perpetuate the life of believers so as that they shall not die, but gradually partake of a divine vitality that will recuperate and renew their physical as well as their spiritual nature, so that translation, as in the cases of Enoch and Elijah, and not death, shall either be the finale of their earthly existence, or else so as that they shall continue to live on earth with ever-increasing powers during the whole of the Millennial period now commencing.

2. That this virtue in true scriptural, sacrificial worship is available for others as well as for believers themselves, enabling believers, according to the will of God, to infuse vitality into their brethren, whether they be still in the land of the living or sleeping in

Jesus, as all the faithful do. And thus that believers may and shall have a part or a share in bringing about the first resurrection.

3. That, accordingly, the last or seventh trumpet has now sounded, being, like each of the six precedent trumpets, the sound of a world-wide principle or message, and not a literal blast of a wind instrument, as is commonly supposed; which last trumpet message, respecting "the Abomination of Desolation," etc., subverting for ever the death-dealing idol of the mass and all its imitations, and introducing habitual relations of man toward Deity, whereby man drinks in of life for himself and pours out of that life on others, doth originate in and implant through man (by the grace of God, through Jesus Christ, our Lord) an incipient life that will grow the more according as the faith of believers waxes stronger and stronger and diffuses itself more and more widely and deeply in the Church.

4. That sacrificial worship elicits and develops a faculty in man hitherto ignored, buried, and hidden, and not only so, but misapprehended, miscalled, and abused—viz: the spirit—and will gradually tend to a strengthening and invigoration of the same even to "the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ," who, through the spirit, controlled the elements of wind, air, and water, and annihilated the attraction of gravitation; and also wrought effects of a wonderful kind at a great distance from his immediate presence. That this faculty in man is that through which he sees, and that it should only deal mentally with great realities, especially Scriptural realities, as God, heaven, angels, etc.: whereas it has been allowed to degenerate into what is called "the imagination," to be used as the mere plaything of the intellect and to deal almost exclusively with lies and vanity, or to grovel amid loathsome or subtle impurities; that man, habituated through true sacrificial worship as his own priest to deal with the great things of Scripture, will gradually grow to be not only a wonderously holy and righteous being, but one fraught with the divine essence to such a degree as that he shall do the great things of Christ, or "greater than these," because Christ "hath gone to the Father."

5. That Christ calls himself "the Alpha and the Omega," not only

in the commonly accepted sense of "the first and the last," but also from reference to a latent faculty in the sacred Hebrew tongue, through which the Hebrew Scriptures are subject to a law of development cognizable by the learned, although by them carelessly and contemptuously overlooked as cabalistic, notwithstanding its undoubted usage by Jeremiah and perhaps other of the prophets; through which law of development dark passages of the prophets, otherwise quite unintelligible, may be showed to be pregnant with marvels of evangelical light and ecclesiastical wisdom. That thus, and otherwise also, the Bible will at last be found to be a repertory of full remedies for all moral evils, whether individual, domestic, social, or political: and not only so, but to contain prescriptions for perpetuating life in true and loyal believers, and for raising the dead in Christ—those "who sleep in Him," and have so slept for ages—such function now demonstrably appertaining to the Church at least in due measure and according to the Divine will.

6. That "saints' days" were originally set apart for efforts to awaken the dead in Christ, so as that they might come to life again in order to inherit "the kingdom prepared for them from the foundation of the world;" but that the lifeless idol of Antichrist, being substituted all through Christendom for the life-giving sacrifice of Calvary, caused these days to degenerate into occasions of ceremonials of idolatry, blasphemous in their character as it respected God, and calculated to postpone forever the resurrection of the just, injurious prayers being directed toward them, as already in glory, in connection with "the abomination" of Rome, in place of prayers inspired and enforced by the true sacrifice of Calvary and directed to the Throne that Christ might come again in his kingdom and bring these, his saints, with Him. That during our services in Argus Hall the "days" of the Apostles Simon, the Canaanite, and Jude, the brother of James, falling on Sunday, 28th of October, we with a special "collect" and "litanical suffrages," thus came to the help of these Apostles, and that, in like manner, new services are demanded for all such days.

7. That while I thank God that I was assisted with so much success to modify our "Book of Common Prayer and the adminis-

tration of the sacraments" so as that it became fraught with spiritual life and comfort and with elements of spiritual power, I have felt throughout how vastly more rich its developments might be, but that such developments were properly the work of the whole church in Synod assembled, and not of an individual. I consider, therefore, that the testimony given to sound principles in our Argus Hall presentations of the sacrifice is of much greater importance than their concrete expression. Besides I have borne witness before hundreds, if not, indeed, thousands, of intelligent persons to great principles which confirm the teaching of the Reformation, to the effect that at least all Roman Christendom is under the sway of Antichrist and uses a worship that blasphemes God, destroys the soul, and secures the death of the body, too; while in no part of Protestant Christendom has the great principle of sacrifice been developed at all. Acknowledged, indeed, it is as to its institution, but it is not practically acted on nor followed out to its results. While in the unhappy "High Church" section there is an undisguised aping of Roman forms that distinctly indicates how grossly ignorant or disposed to deny their mortal nature both priests and people are.

Now, we proclaim, of all such Romanist or High Church proclivities that they imply an affection toward "the Abomination of Desolation spoken of by Daniel the Prophet," and verge closely upon absolute apostasy from the truth as it is in Jesus. I am convinced that, until the worship of the Church becomes, as ours in Argus Hall has been, purely and simply sacrificial in the Evangelical sense, the sacramental apostasy (which was consummated at Rome) will be ever imminent. I further allege that all the Clergy who neglect these truths will be answerable for the lives of the people, which they might otherwise save, and whom they might lead to immortality: but these they are now leading, through their ignorance of these truths, or indifference to them, to the grave and corruption, to putridity and to the worm, and that, when it is in their power to lead them to an escape henceforward from the gloomy portals of the grave to life and immortality. Having borne my testimony as far as in my power lay, and led at least not a few into the way of life, I feel, since I can do no more, that the proper end of my work, so far,

is a solemn public act of testimony such as I thus make, stating its nature and its issue.

Read three times in the presence of separate congregations in Argus Hall, to wit: morning, afternoon and night, on Sunday, December 30th, 1866.

TRESHAM DAMES GREGG,

DOCTOR IN SACRED THEOLOGY,

AND

CHAPLAIN OF ST. NICHOLAS WITHIN. DUBLIN.

“WE, the undersigned, have been present at some, if not all, the services solemnized by the Reverend TRESHAM D. GREGG, D. D., in Argus Hall, 600 Broadway, New York, some of us not having missed any of his ministrations; and we do hereby testify that his reasonings in support of his great positions have been so entirely Scriptural and so sustained by learning and argument that *we have been convinced of their truth*, and believe that until they are generally adopted by the whole Church, the world will not reach the glory intended for it and promised to the last days.

Argus Hall, December 30, 1866.

Signed,

B. WM. ENNIS, 45 Ann street,

and by twenty others.



ERRATA.



Page 9,	line 12,	read	Westminster	for	Westminster
" 15,	" 29,	"	<i>Imperatore</i>	"	<i>Imperators</i>
" 15,	" 30,	"	<i>Papatus</i>	"	<i>Papatum</i>
" 16,	" 14,	"	before Mr. Elliott, etc.	"	before, etc.
" 16,	" 23,	"	the decade of the sixties	"	the 60th decade
" 19,	" 20,	"	scarlatina	"	scarlatena
" 22,	" 35,	"	seminal <i>vidus</i> ,	"	seminal growth,
" 24,	" 36,	"	conducted any one at the time	"	conducted at the time
" 25,	" 10,	"	are owing	"	is owing
" 26,	" 13,	"	Narcissus	"	Narcisses
" 27,	" 33,	"	as to speak	"	to speak
" 28,	" 34,	"	remotion	"	re-motion
" 29,	" 32,	"	tribunals	"	tribunal,
" 36,	" 11,	"	Westminster	"	Westminster
" 36,	" 18,	"	Westminster	"	Westminster
" 53,	" 16,	"	full.	"	fall.
" 54,	" 14,	"	<i>omnium</i>	"	<i>omnium</i> .
" 118,	" 22,	"	Canon	"	Cannon.
" 120,	" 21,	"	Westminster	"	Westminster
" 123,	" 8,	"	every way	"	away.
" 125,	" 16,	"	<i>the decade of the sixties</i>	"	<i>the 60th decade</i>
" 125,	" 26,	"	has	"	had
" 129,	" 11,	"	beneficed	"	benefice
" 131,	" 34,	"	believers	"	believeers

LIST OF THE PRINCIPAL PUBLICATIONS FROM THE PEN OF

REV. FRESHAM DAMES GREGG, D. D.

REPORT OF THE NINE DAYS' DISCUSSION

Between the REV. TRESHAM DAMES GREGG, D. D., and the Late REV. THOMAS MAGUIRE, P. P., the Great Champion of the Papacy.



The discussion was held in the Round Room of the Rotunda, Dublin, and commenced on May 29th, 1838. The Rev. EDWARD NAGLE, Rector of Skreen, and the late Rev. JUSTIN M'NAMARA, P. P., of Kinsale, occupying the Chair.

It was occasioned by a Challenge, addressed in one of his Sermons, to the Clergy generally, by Father Maguire; he being the acknowledged and famous Champion of the Church of Rome.

From the Church of England Gazette.

The discussion in Dublin between our old friend, the Rev. T. D. Gregg, and Father Maguire has terminated; and it is agreed on all hands that the priest of the Ancient Catholic Faith has gloriously triumphed over the wily advocate of the new and degrading religion known by the name of Popery. The matter will not end with the Dublin discussion; it will be followed up, not only in Dublin, but in England, with a power and energy which will make Popery quail, and skulk in the dark places of the earth. We congratulate Mr. Gregg on the success of his important struggle, and on the feeling which has been manifested towards him by his brethren.

From the Liverpool Standard.

The discussion has more than realized the most sanguine expectations of the friends of true and unadulterated Christianity. Day after day did Mr. Gregg meet the cavils and demolish the sophistries of his crafty opponent. The sword of truth has proved indeed a powerful weapon in the hands of the admirable champion of Protestantism. Fears were entertained when he entered the arena with so accomplished a logician and so eloquent a speaker as the doughty priest Maguire; but we are proud to say that Mr. Gregg has proved himself, in every respect, more than a match for his opponent.

We sincerely hope that the proceedings of this triumphant discussion may shortly be published, so as to be accessible to all classes of the community. We are sure that much good may be done by their dissemination in England.

Second Notice.

That Mr. Gregg has acquitted himself with zeal, energy, and talent in the course of this protracted discussion, is evident. But who or what has triumphed? Is it merely Mr. Gregg that has achieved a victory over his subtle and crafty opponent? Is it merely the personal triumph of one out of two acute logicians or accomplished scholars? No! It is a far greater victory than this. It is the triumph of the purity of Protestantism over the complicated abominations of Popery. It is the triumph of truth over error, and Christian knowledge over sottish superstition—of charity over bigotry—of the immutable Word of God over the cunningly-devised fables of the Church of Rome. The effects of this glorious victory will be long felt, in Ireland especially, and throughout the whole extent of the usurped dominion of the Papacy. A spirit of inquiry has been already generated, which cannot but lead to the most satisfactory results.

From the Londonderry Standard.

The most extraordinary discussion perhaps ever witnessed—that which recently occupied the public mind—has come to a close. A victory more complete we could not have wished for. Mr. Gregg proved himself a very David against the Popish Goliath. He had no mercy on the apostate Church—he dealt his blows one after another with a force and pertinacity which astonished while it stupified his adversary. People could scarce believe their ears while the Protestant champion uttered the tremendous truths of Christianity before those who only knew them through the mist and shadow of Roman dogmatism. It almost appeared as if this brilliant disputant had been raised up for the overthrow of Popery in this country; at least he spoke as if he thought so. His denunciations of the apostate Church and its theologians were terrific. Even in the poorest weapon of the controversialist, that of personal sarcasm, he was unmeasurably more skillful than his opponent.

From the Westmeath Guardian.

The issue of the contest between the two Churches will naturally benefit the cause of truth, and should be hailed with satisfaction and delight by every friend of civil and religious liberty. Mr. Maguire left the field in possession of his opponent. He was foiled in argument, defeated in all his false positions, and driven out of all his resources.

* * * The Notices of all the contemporaneous Church of England Papers were of the same character.

MEDE'S APOSTASY OF THE LATTER TIMES.

With an Introductory Essay on the Proper Mode of Maintaining the Roman Catholic Controversy.

This work was published before the Discussion with Father Maguire, and propounded the method of procedure which was then so signally triumphant.

1830.

THE APOSTASY OF THE CHURCH OF ROME CLEARLY DEMONSTRATED.

Ad Interim.

ORDER OF MORNING AND EVENING SACRIFICE THROUGHOUT THE YEAR.

Submitted to the Church of Christ.

THE CROWN OF THE ASCENDENCY OF TRUTH, ETC.

1838.

FREE THOUGHTS ON PROTESTANT MATTERS.

An Essay on the Constitution—in Theory, in Practice, in Possibility. Dedicated,
by permission, to BENJAMIN DISRAELI, Esq., M. P.

“Original, eloquent, and powerful.”—*The Statesman*.

ESSAY ON THE SEVENTY WEEKS.

Preached before the University of Dublin, Ireland.

THE WAY, THE TRUTH, AND THE LIFE.

A Series of Discourses Preached in St. Peters, Hammersmith, England.
With an Appendix.

A Summary of Philosophy; or, an Essay on the Metaphysics of the
Holy Scriptures.

ESSAY ON THE FIRST LESSON FOR THE MORNING OF THE NATIVITY.

Here, for the first time, Correctly Expounded.

THE TIME AND THE CHURCH OF IRELAND.



“THE MOST HOLY AND ADORABLE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.”

An Illustration.

The Illustration, so Entitled, Explained and Justified.

"THE ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION SPOKEN OF BY
DANIEL THE PROPHET."



"THE MOST HOLY AND ADORABLE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS."

THE ILLUSTRATION SO ENTITLED EXPLAINED AND JUSTIFIED.

Undoubtedly the most extraordinary object in the world is that which is called by the Roman Catholics "THE HOST OF THE MASS"—otherwise THE VICTIM, (for the word *host*, *hostia* in Latin, means *victim*), or "Sacrifice of the Mass." According to the theory of the Romanists, this consecrated wafer is the very and true God—"the body, blood, soul, and divinity of Jesus Christ." And millions believe this, and have powerful arguments, as it appears to them, to show that there is the height of wisdom manifested on the part of the Lord in being pleased to allow Himself to be thus presented to men. On the other hand, Protestants believe the whole theory to be "a mockery, a delusion, and a snare;" that it is the cornerstone of a system invented by priests and based on a perversion of the words and true meaning of our Lord. And so, we have Christendom divided into two great parties—the Romanists and their sympathisers on the one side; and those who protest against their views, and are therefore called *Protestants*, on the other. Either view, however, justifies our opening observation. For that Deity should be so presentable—in appearance, weak, perishing, evanescent—to be seen, taken in the hand, and eaten up, would be most astonishing. Whereas, on the other hand, that such an object, according to our views so paltry and despicable, should, as the centre of a system of lying, hypocrisy and delusion, have wrought in the world the wonders it *has* wrought, would render it only less marvelous and surprising. Now we avow that we take the Protestant view of the subject; but we have been led much beyond the ordinary Protestant theory, and have written a very elaborate work, entitled, "The Mystery of God Finished," in which we prove to demonstration that the idol of the mass is described at large, as a diabolical object, in the Bible—but all through in the way of enigma and dark allusion. It seems to have been the wisdom of God to allow man's genius to work upon revealed truth with perfectly unlimited freedom, with the view of demonstrating to the universe what an extraordinary system of priest-craft, kingcraft, and unlimited dominion over His people and over their lives, properties, and liberties would grow out of this permitted liberty. The system, thus matured, had reduced the whole world to darkness and serfdom till the sixteenth century. Then God raised up Luther, whose wondrous prophesyings of simple verity shook the earth, liberated some mighty nations, and wrought upon the whole world. But a new demonstration was necessary, and here, again, the Lord allowed the generation of great and devoted men—martyrs and heroes—to pass away, and He gave again perfectly unlimited freedom to man's genius to work with and upon the magnificent verities which the Luthers, the Calvins, the Latimers, the Cranmers, the Riddleys, and the Bradfords had developed—and with what result? Why, it is the plain fact that religious anarchy has well-nigh drowned the world, flooding it with licentiousness, infidelity, and misery; and these reacting towards an absolute restoration of that very Popery which the Reformation had exploded—as constituting, according to man's present views, the lesser of evils. At this stage God again interposes, and by a new development of His truth infinitely transcending that which He was pleased to grant above three centuries ago. He opens His word, so as to enable us to conquer the grave, to raise the dead, to unite the Church, to regenerate the world.* But the first step to all these surpassingly marvelous results is the full exposure of the mystery of what is called "The most Holy and Adorable Sacrifice of the Mass." This exposure is exhaustively accomplished in our aforementioned work, but is briefly shown in our illustration.

The picture is intended to give an idea of the Altar in the Roman Catholic Church with what is called the *monstrance*, or *remonstrance* standing on it, and to reveal, according to the light now thrown upon the subject by opened Scripture, a view of the spiritual circumstances connected with the host of the mass, as it is receiving the worship of those who are led to believe in its divinity.

* See Petition to Convocation of York and Canterbury, 1862-3; and, also, Instrument of Ministerial Testimony.—The latter is reproduced at page 120 of this volume.

A SUMMARY OF PHILOSOPHY; OR, AN ESSAY ON THE METAPHYSICS
OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURE.

Ascertains the indubitable essential difference (which is not reason) in humanity,
unfolds the true theory of vision, free from the absurd impossibilities that
equally pervade the molecular and undulatory hypotheses, and
explodes generally the mischievous dreams of the rational-
istic metaphysicians from Locke to Kant.

THE STEAM LOCOMOTIVE REVEALED IN THE BIBLE.

An Exposition of Ezekiel I.

(Otherwise absolutely unintelligible).

LEVIATHAN.

THE IRONCLADS OF THE SEA REVEALED IN THE BIBLE.

An Exposition of Job xli.

KING EDWARD VI.

An Historical Drama, in Five Acts, after the Elizabethan Model.

"We close the volume with a deep feeling of admiration, recognizing in it a worthy
revival of the Elizabethan Drama."—*The late Ernest Jones, in the "People's Paper."*

MARY TUDOR, FIRST QUEEN REGENT OF ENGLAND.

A Drama in Five Acts.

"Many a clergyman has secured a mitre for a less effort than this."—*Rev. Richard
Wilson, D. D., in the "Educational Times."*

QUEEN ELIZABETH; OR, THE ORIGIN OF SHAKESPEARE.

A Drama in Five Acts.

"Surpasses the previous dramas of the author,"—*Dublin Evening Mail.*

THE JESEIDE.

In Five Books.

By DAVID, KING OF ISRAEL, AND OTHERS.

Translated into English Verse, from the Original Hebrew, with Notes Critical and
Explanatory; together with

"THE MAN OF DOOM," AND OTHER PIECES.

1861.

THE MYSTERY OF GOD FINISHED.

Unseals the hidden words of Daniel, and affords a clue to the hitherto unexplored depths and recesses of the Word of God.

THIRD EDITION.

SERMONS ON THE DOCTRINES OF THE CHURCH.

With an Appendix, and Notes on Its Discipline.

1868.

THE TIME OF THE RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS.

A Demonstrative Lecture.

SUGGESTIONS AS TO THE EMPLOYMENT OF A *NOVUM*
ORGANUM MORALIUM;

Or, Thoughts on the Nature of the *Differential Calculus*, and on the Application of its Principles to Metaphysics, with a view to the attainment of Demonstration and Certainty in Moral, Political and Ecclesiastical affairs.

This short work discovers the source of the true, the beautiful, and the sublime, in poetry and in expression, and of the degeneracy of the present age in these particulars: and affords a clue to the solution of most of the mysteries that have in every age exercised the minds of men.

"Your conclusions are indubitable, and may be otherwise attained to,"—*Rev. Richard Wilson, D.D., late Fellow of St. John's College, Cambridge, Editor of the "Educational Times."*

THE ALPHOMEGAIC PRINCIPLE;

Or, a brief Explanation of the Philological sense in which the Lord Jesus, the Messiah, is the Alpha and Omega of the Sacred Scriptures.

THIRD EDITION.

METHODIZATION OF THE HEBREW VERBS, REGULAR
AND IRREGULAR.

The most effective key to the difficulties of the Hebrew tongue ever given to students.

"I consider your 'Methodization of the Hebrew Verbs' the very best Manual of the Hebrew Grammar that is in existence;—for the verbs regular and irregular, may be said to comprise the essentials of the whole Grammar; nor do I think that without it any one can be complete master of the subject. I am delighted to find that you propose to bring out a Third Edition."—*Letter from the Rev. George Fish, LL.D., Prebendary of Lichfield, and Rector of Great Malvern.*

ON THE SACRED LAW OF 1866.

CONFERRING PERPETUAL LIFE WITH IMMUNITY FROM
DECAY AND DISEASE.



A CENTO OF DECISIVE SCRIPTURAL ORACLES

STRANGELY DISCOVERED,

SHOWING WHENCE, FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT, THE
MYSTICAL NUMBER

666

IS DRAWN INTO THE APOCALYPSE, AND THAT IT CONSTITUTES

THE KEY

TO THE GATE OF IMMORTALITY.

וְהָיָה מִסְתֵּרָא בִּיחְדָּוָה עַל־שֵׁשׁסָט וּפְתָחָ וְאֵין סֵגֶר וּסְגֵרָ וְאֵין פְּתָח:
יְשַׁעְיָה כְּבִי כִי

*Ὁ νικῶν, δώσω αὐτῷ καθύδαί μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν τῷ ἑρῳῳ μου, ὥς καὶ γὰρ
ἐνικηδᾶ, καὶ ἐκαθύδα μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς μου.—Αποκ. γ. 21.*

“Hæc dicit, Sanctus et verax ille, qui habet clavem Davidis: qui aperit, et nemo claudit: claudit, et nemo aperit.”—*Apoc. iii. 7.*

BY

TRESHAM DAMES GREGG, D.D.,

Chantry Priest of St. Nicholas Within, Dublin.



LONDON: SIMPKIN, MARSHALL & CO.,

DUBLIN: HODGES, FOSTER & CO.,

1875.

[*All Rights Reserved.*]

PREFACE.

IN publishing a book which affirms that the Editor has discovered in the Bible the law of literal corporeal immortality, with that of perpetual health and freedom from decay, he thinks it proper to say that he is aware of the incredulity with which it will at first be encountered, but at the same time satisfied that it will overcome all opposition, and lead to the final and universal establishment of the principal contended for. He will devote this Preface to an endeavour to meet a few obvious objections. 1. There are texts countless of the character of the following, viz. :—" It is appointed unto men once to die, and after death the judgment " (*Heb. ix. 27*); " The days of our years are threescore years and ten; and if by reason of their strength they be fourscore years, yet is their strength labour and sorrow, so soon passeth it away and we are gone " (*Psa. xc. 10.*) : " Ye know not what shall be on the morrow, for what is your life? It is even a vapour that appeareth for a little time, and then vanisheth away " (*Jas. iv. 14*); such passages conveying the burden of almost the whole Bible are innumerable. Granted; yet are they all preliminary to a future of a totally different character, which was as elaborately foreshown by prophets and apostles, and which is often set forth, and very particularly near the end of the last book in the Bible thus: " There shall be no more death, neither sorrow nor crying, neither shall there be any more pain, for the former things are passed away." (*Rev. xxi. 4*). Now, the coming of this future repeals all these texts, showing that they belong to " the former things " which should " pass away," and which have passed away by the formal message which was delivered to all mankind by a duly ordained, retained, and paid servant of the Lord Jesus Christ, at the appointed and expected time in 1866, the year foreshown from the beginning of the world, as these pages prove. Hence, the objections based on these texts are groundless. 2. Men say the Apostles are dead—the Prophets are dead—all the holy men of old are dead, and can we suppose that you and we should be exceptions to the universal law of death at the usual limit of threescore or fourscore years? Now, I ask, did Peter or Paul, did James or John, did Abraham or Malachi live at A. D. 1866? If then that year were the year of doom, why should the death of these men of God at an antecedent epoch oppose itself to our survival, when the time—even the set time—hath come? Literal immortality was tied to the epoch of which I have made mention, and to a law which that epoch should introduce: therefore deaths at a previous period were as necessary as it was to travel by sail vessels and waggon service in the 16th century, or to do without magnetic telegraphy in the 18th. 3. But, men have been dying ever since 1866; none have survived since. Well, Christ came as the Saviour of the soul in A. D. 1. He suffered in A. D. 33. His religion was very generally received about the age of Constantine in the 4th century; yet ever since souls

have perished through infidelity or incomplete faith in the Redeemer. Why should not like causes sufficiently explain the death of Christians in the body since 1866? Let this little work be studied in all its facts, and it sets forth nothing but Scriptural truths, which not one in a thousand million have ever heard of; and that although the commands were express and imperative, *read therein by day, meditate therein by night*, yet *not one* obeyed the command, why then should we wonder that "that day" came upon them as "a thief in the night," and as "a snare upon all those that dwell upon the face of the earth." (*2 Pet. iii 10; Luke xxi. 35.*) 4. It will be objected to me that I call myself in the title a Chantry priest, and I shall be asked what is a Chantry priest? A Chantry priest is simply a Christian minister set apart for a service of song, in a Chantry Chapel or place of song. But as the denomination is close to my subject, and as the meeting of the objection will be important to the whole Church, I shall meet it by a new and more exact rendering of the celebrated passage from Job xix., that occurs in the Burial Service, and which, properly interpreted, will help my cause, and do a great amount, as I trust, of general good. Verses 25, 26, 27: "For I know that there will be redeemers of life [that is, an order of men set apart to raise the dead], and that in the latter day they shall assemble them over the dust [of the dead that is]; and after my awakening [*i. e.*, after my spirit shall be awakened to expect its junction with the body], they shall smite upon this [the dust], and from my flesh [*i. e.*, with a raised body] I shall behold God: whom I shall see for myself [*i. e.*, standing up on my behalf 'I shall see for me' on my side], and not a strange [or hostile] (*see Deut. xxxii 12, Heb.*) God. I have said enough" [that is, I have completely finished my oracle].* Now, the redeemers of life, or restorers of life through our Lord, here spoken of, are just chantry priests—clergymen specially set apart to raise the dead. I, as a fisher of men, am constantly occupied in efforts to affect this object, and I am sure that I shall at last succeed. The grave is the true Purgatory. The purgatory of Romanism is simply the revival by Antichrist, the Roman Pontiff, of the mythological purgatory of the pagan Roman poets, very elegantly set forth by *Virgil* in *Æneid*, lib. vi., 735, 750, and elsewhere also referred to, but it is simply fabulous. However, what the grave of the Christian receives in corruption, it sends forth in incorruption; what it admits in dishonor, it opens out to glory; and what it gets in weakness, it raises in power; changing


* "They shall assemble them" (Hebrew יִסְּמְּוּ) according to the A. V., the future of יָסַד to stand. Accordingly, our translators have "He shall stand." But I submit that it is the future of יָסַד, with elision of a י, and וּ [= them] affixed. The same verb occurs (*Gen. i. 9*) as יִסְּמְּוּ: "Let the waters be gathered." The oracle thus viewed shows that there are two stages in the work of resurrection—the first being the awakening of the Spirit, and the next a smiting or shaking of the buried debris; as above, "They shall smite upon this." I believe our Lord alludes to this in "Knock and it shall be opened to you;" and it is also alluded to in "the valley of dry bones" of Ezek. xxxvii. 7, "And behold a shaking!"—the smiting mentioned above shaking the graves. The concluding words וְיִסְּמְּוּ, which are pointed to mean, "my reins are consumed," are, as I submit, for וְיִסְּמְּוּ "finishing, I have finished"—said enough, *i. e.*, the participle and preterite of יָסַד 1st singular. Perhaps it will not be denied to be memorable that the oracle actually involves the date *An. Dom.* When this wonderful advance in Divine knowledge should begin to operate; for, through the principle of numerical equivalence mentioned elsewhere, the passage changed will read thus:—"For I know that there will be redeemers of life, and that in 1870 they will assemble them over the dust," etc. If this refer to the decade (as it well may) that decade which follows next after the famous 60th of the nineteenth century, now current, and if within its limits there should be a realization of the truth, it would be a matter of remembrance for ever.

natural to spiritual, and crumbling Adamic dust to imperishable Messianic body. Thus am I a chantry priest, expecting in no long time to lead the worship in my restored church, that will be habitually visited by celestial beings delighting to present themselves in the kingdom of God on earth—once again rendered a Paradise. I call myself a chantry priest, for such I am by the ancient law of the Church, towards which I have always comported myself with the simplicity of a little child (*see Matt. xviii. 3*), and I am convinced that such tractableness is absolutely necessary if men would enjoy the kingdom of heaven. My clients are nine individuals, viz.: John, Earl of Worcester, and Elizabeth, his wife; Sir Edward Dudley, and Matilda, his wife; Sir Thomas Bathe, John Chevir, Thomas Bermingham, Stephen Butler, and John West. These it is my solemn duty to liberate from Purgatory, that is, to raise from the dead; and two additional confraternities of nine each are superadded to my care. Now my work as a chantry priest is specially devoted to these; and by the overthrow of the recusant Church of Ireland, the Lord has given me a clear stage for my work. Aid in it I much require. The site of my chapel, the ancient Church of St. Nicholas Within, Dublin, remains to me secured by law. Now I ask the benevolent of the Church universal to assist with me in its restoration. Sir Benjamin Guinness restored St. Patrick's Church; Mr. Henry Roe is engaged in the restoration of Christ's Church. I solicited both these gentlemen to help in my work, but they declined to do so. I now in this little book bring the subject before the whole world; and I answer for it, that if the Lord stir up the heart of any of His servants to help thus, the work that shall be thus completed will, by the grace and providence of God, give literal immortality to mankind, and regenerate the whole world.

ST. NICHOLAS WITHIN, DUBLIN,

18th May, 1875 : 3:40 p. m.







**This book is under no circumstances to be
taken from the Building**

[illegible]

